arXiv:1412.7331v2 [math.OC] 20 Jul 2016

On Uniform Tauberian Theorems for Dynamic Games*

Dmitry Khlopin

khlopin@imm.uran.ru

July 21, 2016

Abstract

The paper is concerned with two-person dynamic zero-sum games in continuous setting. We investigate the limit of value functions of finite horizon games with long run average cost as the time horizon tends to infinity and the limit of value functions of λ-discounted games as the discount tends to zero. Under quite weak assumptions on the game, we prove the Uniform Tauberian Theorem: existence of a uniform limit for one of the value functions implies the uniform convergence of the other one to the same limit. We also prove the analogs of the One-sided Tauberian Theorem, i.e., the inequalities on asymptotics for the lower and upper games. Also, a variant of the theorem for discrete-time games is treated separately. Special attention is devoted to the case of differential games. The key roles in the proof were played by Bellman's optimality principle and the closedness of strategies under concatenation.

Keywords: Dynamic programming principle; game with zero sum; Tauberian theorem; Abel mean; Cesaro mean; differential games; slowly varying function; subsolution
MSC2010 91A25,91A50,49N70,91A23,49L20,40E05

Hardy once proved (see, for example, [27]) that, for a bounded sequence of numbers a_i,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}a_i=\lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0}\lambda\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}(1-\lambda)^{i-1}a_i$$

if there exists at least one of these limits. This result was named a Tauberian theorem in honor of the similar result obtained by Tauber for convergent series. Theorems of this kind, in particular, provide the means for obtaining good estimates for sums of series with the use of faster methods of summation. For a more detailed treatment of the history of those results, see, for example, [10]. There are also Tauberian theorems for functions, in particular (see, for

*Krasovskii Institute,, Yekaterinburg, Russia; Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia

example, [26, Sect. 6.8]), for a bounded continuous function g, the limit of long run averages and limit of discounted averages (Cesaro mean and Abel mean, respectively)

$$\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T g(t)\,dt, \qquad \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}g(t)\,dt$$

coincide if there exists at least one of these limits.

What if we optimize the Abel mean and/or Cesaro mean and then consider the limit of the optimal values corresponding to them? Such limit value (as the discount tends to zero) was first considered in [11] for a stochastic formulation. As proved in [38], for a stochastic two-person game with a finite number of states and actions, optimal long-time averages and optimal discounted averages share the common limit. For more details on the limit value for Abel mean and/or Cesaro mean in other stochastic formulations, see [13, 49, 50].

In the deterministic case, the question of existence of limit values arose in the control theory, time and again; one may at the very least note [16, 21, 25, 37]. In the ergodic case (more generally, in the nonexpansive-like case) such limits exist and, moreover, they are independent of the initial state [2, 4, 5, 6, 7]. For the latest results on existence of the limit values (first of all, in the nonergodic case), refer to [22, 23, 42]; see also the review in [12, Sect. 3.4]. For a bibliography on discrete statements, refer to [43].

For control problems, the equality of limit values in the case when at least one of those limits is constant was first proved in [3]. The very general case of dynamic system was considered in paper [41]. Namely, it was proved there that existence of a uniform (on the set of states) limit for the value of one of the means implies the uniform convergence for value of the other one to the same limit. That paper also contains a beautiful introduction to the history of the subject and a review of publications in the field. For discrete time systems, the equality of limit values was proved earlier in [35].

Until very recently, there was only a rather small number of publications concerned with the study of the limits of optimal averages in differential games. These are, first of all, [1, 7, 14] and, in addition, [9, 24]. In differential games of the special kind, those limits may be connected with the asymptotic value of zero-sum repeated games; a good discussion of this issue is presented in [47], see [15] on Tauberian theorem for repeated games. Moreover, as noted in [41] for differential games, "When the dynamic is controlled by two players with opposite goals, a Tauberian theorem is given in the ergodic case by Theorem 2.1 in [1]. However, the general, nonergodic case is still an open problem in both the discrete and the continuous settings."

However, now, the situation has changed. Firstly, a Tauberian theorem was proposed for differential games in nonergodic case in [31]. In [50], a very general approach to proof of Tauberian theorem was proposed for games with two players with opposite goals in discrete setting.

In this paper, we show a number of uniform Tauberian theorems for dynamic two-person games with zero sum, in particular, for differential games, for normal form games, and for games in discrete setting. Our approach to proofs continues the ideas of [35, 38, 41]: Bellman's optimality principle and the closedness of strategies under concatenation. Under these circumstances, the specifics of a game with a saddle point (in particular, of a differential game under Isaacs condition) allows to streamline the proof of the uniform Tauberian theorem as related to them. Such proof reduces to the two inequalities for the lower and upper games, respectively; following [10] and [26], we call those inequalities One-sided Tauberian theorems. After that, the proof of One-sided Tauberian theorem boils down to the application of the suboptimality principle to the strategy that is constructed in a special way through concatenation.

Recall that [41] provides an example showing that the Tauberian theorem for control problem may not hold if the limits are not uniform over the strongly invariant set of positions. The condition of existence of a uniform limit in the case of Tauberian theorem for dynamic games is certainly as significant. However, this condition may be relaxed for construction of one-sided estimates. Firstly, in construction of such bounds, one could use any function satisfying the corresponding Dynamic Programming Principle in place of the value function of the original problem. Secondly, for this function, we can replace the condition of existence of the uniform limit with the condition of slow variation (or even monotonicity).

The structure of the paper is as follows. We start by formulating the Tauberian theorems for normal form games (Theorems 1,2) in Sect. 1. Then, we consider an axiomatic definition of a rather general game problem statement in the framework of the dynamic model proposed in [41] (see Sect. 2). At the same place, we formulate Theorems 3,4, the main results of this paper. The first of these is based on the existence of a saddle point value in all the considered games, the other one essentially requires the upper value to be greater or equal to the lower value for all of the games. In the next Section (Sect. 3), we show the connection between the One-sided Tauberian theorem, slowly varying functions, and suboptimality principle. Sect. 4 contains the proofs of Theorems 3,4 and their corollaries, including (the proof of) Theorems 1,2. Sect. 5 is devoted to Tauberian theorem (Theorem 5) for games in discrete setting. Most of the proofs are located in Appendix. In addition, Appendix D serves to transfer the results obtained for the abstract statement onto the case of differential games (Theorem 6).

We would like to note that Theorem 6 and Theorem 4 for more strong assumptions were also proved in [31] and [32], respectively.

1 Normal form game with zero sum

Define $\mathbb{T} \triangleq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Assume the following items are given:

- a nonempty set Ω;
- a nonempty subset $\mathbb{K}$ of mappings from $\mathbb{T}$ to Ω;
- a running cost $g : \Omega \mapsto [0,1]$; for each process $z \in \mathbb{K}$, assume the map $t \mapsto g(z(t))$ is Borel-measurable.

Let us now define concatenation on processes. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{T}, z', z'' \in \mathbb{K}$ be such that $z'(\tau) = z''(0)$. Then, their concatenation $z' \diamond_\tau z''$, a mapping from $\mathbb{T}$ to Ω, is defined by the following rule:

$$(z' \diamond_\tau z'')(t) \triangleq \begin{cases} z'(t), & t \le \tau; \\ z''(t-\tau), & t > \tau. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

For all $\omega \in \Omega$, let there be given the non-empty sets $\mathcal{L}(\omega), \mathcal{M}(\omega)$. Define sets $\mathfrak{L}, \mathfrak{M}$ of all selectors $\Omega \ni \omega \to l(\omega) \in \mathcal{L}(\omega)$, $\Omega \ni \omega \to m(\omega) \in \mathcal{M}(\omega)$, respectively. Let, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, each pair $(l,m) \in \mathfrak{L} \times \mathfrak{M}$ of players' rules generate a unique process $z[\omega, l, m] \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $z[\omega, l, m](0) = \omega$.

Theorem 1 *For all $\tau > 0$, assume that, for all $l', l'' \in \mathfrak{L}$, there exists $l^* \in \mathfrak{L}$ such that, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, one has*

$$\big\{z[\omega, l^*, m'] \big| \, m' \in \mathfrak{M}\big\} = \Big\{z[\omega, l', m'] \diamond_\tau z\big[\omega', l'', m''\big] \Big| \, m', m'' \in \mathfrak{M}, \omega' \triangleq z\big[\omega, l', m'\big](\tau) \in \Omega\Big\} \subset \mathbb{K}; \tag{2a}$$

moreover, for all $m', m'' \in \mathfrak{M}$, there exists $m^* \in \mathfrak{M}$ such that, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, one has

$$\big\{z[\omega, l', m^*] \big| \, l' \in \mathfrak{L}\big\} = \Big\{z[\omega, l', m'] \diamond_\tau z[\omega', l'', m''] \Big| \, l', l'' \in \mathfrak{L}, \omega' \triangleq z\big[\omega, l', m'\big](\tau) \in \Omega\Big\} \subset \mathbb{K}. \tag{2b}$$

Assume also that, for each $\lambda, T, h > 0$, $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\mathcal{V}_T^\natural(\omega) \triangleq \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \inf_{m \in \mathfrak{M}} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T g(z[\omega, l, m](t))\, dt = \inf_{m \in \mathfrak{M}} \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T g(z[\omega, l, m](t))\, dt, \tag{3a}$$

$$\mathcal{W}_\lambda^\natural(\omega) \triangleq \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \inf_{m \in \mathfrak{M}} \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} g\big(z[\omega, l, m](t)\big)\, dt = \inf_{m \in \mathfrak{M}} \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} g\big(z[\omega, l, m](t)\big)\, dt \tag{3b}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_T^\natural(\omega) &= \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \inf_{m \in \mathfrak{M}} \left[\frac{1}{T+h} \int_0^h g(z[\omega, l, m](t))\, dt + \frac{T}{T+h} \mathcal{V}_T^\natural\big(z[\omega, l, m](h)\big)\right] \\ &= \inf_{m \in \mathfrak{M}} \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \left[\frac{1}{T+h} \int_0^h g(z[\omega, l, m](t))\, dt + \frac{T}{T+h} \mathcal{V}_T^\natural\big(z[\omega, l, m](h)\big)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{3c}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_\lambda^\natural(\omega) &= \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \inf_{m \in \mathfrak{M}} \left[\lambda \int_0^h e^{-\lambda t} g\big(z[\omega, l, m](t)\big)\, dt + e^{-\lambda h} \mathcal{W}_\lambda^\natural\big(z[\omega, l, m](h)\big)\right] \\ &= \inf_{m \in \mathfrak{M}} \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \left[\lambda \int_0^h e^{-\lambda t} g\big(z[\omega, l, m](t)\big)\, dt + e^{-\lambda h} \mathcal{W}_\lambda^\natural\big(z[\omega, l, m]\big](h)\big)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{3d}$$

Then, the following limits exist, are uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$, and coincide

$$\lim_{T \uparrow \infty} \mathcal{V}_T^\natural(\omega) = \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_\lambda^\natural(\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega \tag{4}$$

if at least one of these limits exists, and is uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$.

This theorem itself will be proved in Sect. 4 as an immediate consequence of Theorem 3. In view of that, conditions $(2a), (2b)$ express nothing more than the need to test the closedness with respect to concatenation.

In Theorem 1, we also need a saddle point for all the games considered. This condition can be relaxed, which will also simplify conditions $(2a), (2b)$.

Theorem 2 *Assume that, for all $\tau > 0$, each of the sets $\mathfrak{L}$ and $\mathfrak{M}$ is equipped with a binary operation $\diamond_\tau$ such that, for all $l', l'' \in \mathfrak{L}, m', m'' \in \mathfrak{M}$,*

$$z\big[\omega, l' \diamond_\tau l'', m' \diamond_\tau m''\big] = z[\omega, l', m'] \diamond_\tau z\big[z[\omega, l', m'](\tau), l'', m''\big] \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega, \tag{5a}$$

$$\exists\, l \in \mathfrak{L}, m \in \mathfrak{M} \qquad l' \diamond_\tau l = l', m' \diamond_\tau m = m'. \tag{5b}$$

If there exist the limits in

$$\lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \sup_{l\in\mathfrak{L}} \inf_{m\in\mathfrak{M}} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T g(z[\omega, l, m](t))\, dt = \lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \inf_{m\in\mathfrak{M}} \sup_{l\in\mathfrak{L}} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T g(z[\omega, l, m](t))\, dt \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega, \tag{6a}$$

in addition, these limits are uniform on Ω, and coincide, then all limits in

$$\lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0} \sup_{l\in\mathfrak{L}} \inf_{m\in\mathfrak{M}} \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} g(z[\omega, l, m](t))\, dt = \lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0} \inf_{m\in\mathfrak{M}} \sup_{l\in\mathfrak{L}} \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} g(z[\omega, l, m](t))\, dt \ \forall \omega \in \Omega \tag{6b}$$

exist, are uniform on Ω, and coincide with the limits in $(6a)$.

On the other hand, if limits in $(6b)$ exist, are uniform on Ω, and coincide, then the limits in $(6a)$ exist, are uniform on Ω, and coincide with limits in $(6b)$.

The theorem will be proved in Sect. 4. For the use of condition $(5a)$ for differential games, refer to [31, Remark 3.2].

2 Abstract dynamic game with zero sum

Before exploring the formal definitions, let us sketch a possible interpretation of the necessary formalizations. For stochastic games, a similar statement may be found in [45].

Assume players get some information on state at the current time, but all information on this that is available to the players is contained in a certain signal ω; denote the set of all possible signals by Ω. Since the game develops with time, we can consider the set $\mathbb{K}$, which would contain all processes $t \mapsto \omega(t)$ that are possible for the given game. Assume the current value of running cost is known at every point of time and, therefore, contained in the signal, i.e., can be described by a function that depends only on ω. Then, by virtue of the known dependence $t \mapsto \omega(t)$, i.e., in view of the element $z \in \mathbb{K}$, we can reconstruct the value of the payoff function that realizes.

Each player also may make private actions according to some rule, as a function of the signal; in this case, there may be some restrictions on the rule's feasibility and on the use of information. We will only assume that the set of such feasible rules is nonempty (playable strategy); later, we will also require the existence of ε-optimal rule for each player. For a fixed initial signal ω, every pair of rules chosen by the players restores some processes $z \in \mathbb{K}$ with the property $z(0) = \omega$ (in the case of the normal form games, such a process is unique). Denote all such z by $\Gamma(\omega)$. On the other hand, each player has the right to publish his decision rule in advance. This act would map to every such rule some subset of $\mathbb{K}$ of the various z that agree with this rule. Exhausting all the rules, we obtain a set of such subsets, one set for each player ($\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ for the first and the second player, respectively).

If one of the players, let it be the first one, publishes his rule, with this act essentially defining $A \in \mathfrak{A}$, let us assume that now the second player has the right to use any information in the choice of initial ω, or rather a process $z \in A \cap \Gamma(\omega)$. We (at least, within Theorem 3) are going to consider the case when mandating the publication for one of the players (discrimination against this player) does not change the value that is guaranteed to him by the initial information, i.e., when there is a saddle point in such a game.

Let us now proceed to formal definitions.

Dynamic system. Assume we are given a nonempty set Ω, a nonempty subset $\mathbb{K}$ of mappings from $\mathbb{T}$ to Ω, and a running cost $g : \Omega \mapsto [0, 1]$ such that, for each process $z \in \mathbb{K}$, the map $t \mapsto g(z(t))$ is Borel-measurable. For all $\tau \in \mathbb{T}, z', z'' \in \mathbb{K}$ with $z'(\tau) = z''(0)$, we can define the concatenation $z' \diamond_\tau z'' : \mathbb{T} \to \Omega$ by the rule (1).

We would also need the set

$$\Gamma(\omega) \triangleq \{z \in \mathbb{K} \,|\, z(0) = \omega\},$$

defined for each $\omega \in \Omega$. This is the set of all feasible processes $z \in \mathbb{K}$ that begin at ω.

Let us now define concatenation on subsets of $\mathbb{K}$. For each pair of non-empty subsets of $\mathbb{K}$ and a time $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$, define their concatenation by

$$\begin{aligned} A' \diamond_\tau A'' &\triangleq \{z' \diamond_\tau z'' \,|\, z' \in A', z'' \in A'', z'(\tau) = z''(0)\} \\ &= \{z' \diamond_\tau z'' \,|\, z' \in A', z'' \in A'' \cap \Gamma(z'(\tau))\}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

To get rid of excessive parentheses, let us hereinafter assume $A \diamond_{\tau'} A' \diamond_{\tau''} A'' \triangleq \left(A \diamond_{\tau'} A'\right) \diamond_{\tau''} A''$.

Assumptions on strategies. Assume we are given a non-empty family $\mathfrak{A}$ of subsets of the set $\mathbb{K}$. Call a subset A of the set $\mathbb{K}$ a *playable strategy* if we have $A \cap \Gamma(\omega) \neq \varnothing$ for every initial $\omega \in \Omega$.

We hereinafter impose the following conditions on $\mathfrak{A}$:

($\mathcal{P}$) $\mathfrak{A}$ is some non-empty set of playable strategies;

$(\diamond)$ $\mathfrak{A}$ is closed under concatenation $\diamond$: $\forall \tau > 0, A', A'' \in \mathfrak{A}$ $A' \diamond_\tau A'' \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Condition $(\mathcal{P})$ is necessary for all strategies to be applicable for whichever starting information. Condition $(\diamond)$ allows the player to switch strategies at some a priori defined time.

Formalization of lower game. Consider a two-player lower game with a payoff function $c : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$. The first player wishes to maximize c; the second player wishes to minimize it. The first player also has a family $\mathfrak{A}$ of playable strategies.

The lower game is conducted in the following way: for a given $\omega \in \Omega$, the first player demonstrates a set $A \in \mathfrak{A}$, and then the second player chooses a process $z \in A \cap \Gamma(\omega)$. The value function of this game is

$$\mathbb{V}^\flat[c](\omega) \triangleq \sup_{A \in \mathfrak{A}} \inf_{z \in A \cap \Gamma(\omega)} c(z) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega. \tag{8a}$$

Note that for every playable strategy A, $A \cap \Gamma(\omega) \neq \varnothing$; therefore, this definition is valid if c is bounded.

Definition 1 *For each positive ε, let us say that the lower game of (8a) has an ε-optimal strategy $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ if $\inf_{z \in A} c(z) \geq \mathbb{V}^\flat[c](z(0)) - \varepsilon$.*

Formalization of upper game. We still have two players, the first player maximizes the payoff c, whereas the second player minimizes it. Let the second player also have a family $\mathfrak{B}$ of playable strategies.

The upper game is conducted in the following way. Given $\omega \in \Omega$, let the second demonstrate some set $B \in \mathfrak{B}$, then let the first player choose a process $z \in B \cap \Gamma(\omega)$. The value function of the upper game is

$$\mathbb{V}^\sharp[c](\omega) \triangleq \inf_{B \in \mathfrak{B}} \sup_{z \in B \cap \Gamma(\omega)} c(z) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega. \tag{8b}$$

Definition 2 *For each positive ε, let us say that the upper game of (8b) has an ε-optimal strategy $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ if $\sup_{z \in A} c(z) \leq \mathbb{V}^\sharp[c](z(0)) + \varepsilon$.*

Note that $1 - \mathbb{V}^\sharp[c](\omega) = \sup_{B \in \mathfrak{B}} \inf_{z \in B \cap \Gamma(\omega)} \big(1 - c(z)\big)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, i.e., the upper game with payoff c and with set $\mathfrak{B}$ of the second player's strategies differs from the lower game with payoff $1 - c$ and with set $\mathfrak{B}$ of the first player's strategies only in its sign. Consequently, all definitions and statements below will mostly be given for the lower game. For the upper game families, they can be obtained by the replacement $g^- \triangleq 1 - g$, $\mathbb{A}^- \triangleq \mathbb{B}$.

In what follows, fix $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$; to every payoff c, it is possible to map the pair of corresponding games by rules (8a) and (8b).

Definition 3 *For a payoff* $c : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$, *let us say that the corresponding games have a saddle point if* $\mathbb{V}^\flat[c](\omega) = \mathbb{V}^\sharp[c](\omega)$ *for all* $\omega \in \Omega$.

On various payoffs. Let us now define time average $v_T(z)$ and discount average $w_\lambda(z)$ for each process $z \in \mathbb{K}$ by the rules:

$$v_T(z) \triangleq \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T g(z(t))\,dt, \quad w_\lambda(z) \triangleq \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\,dt \qquad \forall z \in \mathbb{K}, T > 0, \lambda > 0. \tag{9}$$

Note that the definitions are valid, and the means lie within $[0,1]$. The functions v_T, w_λ will be treated as the payoff functions in their respective games. In particular, for any $T, \lambda > 0$, we obtain the values

$$\mathcal{V}_T^\flat(\omega) \triangleq \mathbb{V}^\flat[v_T](\omega) = \sup_{A\in\mathfrak{A}} \inf_{z\in A\cap\Gamma(\omega)} v_T(z), \mathcal{V}_T^\sharp(\omega) \triangleq \mathbb{V}^\sharp[v_T](\omega) = \inf_{B\in\mathfrak{B}} \sup_{z\in B\cap\Gamma(\omega)} v_T(z),\ \forall \omega \in \Omega, \tag{10a}$$

$$\mathcal{W}_\lambda^\flat(\omega) \triangleq \mathbb{V}^\flat[w_\lambda](\omega) = \sup_{A\in\mathfrak{A}} \inf_{z\in A\cap\Gamma(\omega)} w_\lambda(z), \mathcal{W}_\lambda^\sharp(\omega) \triangleq \mathbb{V}^\sharp[w_\lambda](\omega) = \inf_{B\in\mathfrak{B}} \sup_{z\in B\cap\Gamma(\omega)} w_\lambda(z), \forall \omega \in \Omega \tag{10b}$$

We will also need Bolza-type payoffs. For each map $U : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ and positive h, T, λ, define the following payoffs:

$$\hat{c}_{h,T}^U(z) \triangleq \frac{1}{T+h}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \frac{T}{T+h} U_T(z(h)) \qquad \forall z \in \mathbb{K}; \tag{11a}$$

$$\check{c}_{h,\lambda}^U(z) \triangleq \lambda \int_0^h e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\,dt + e^{-\lambda h} U_\lambda(z(h)) \qquad \forall z \in \mathbb{K}. \tag{11b}$$

For the following theorem, in (11*a*) and (11*b*), we need to use $U = \mathcal{V}^\flat = \mathcal{V}^\sharp, U = \mathcal{W}^\flat = \mathcal{W}^\sharp$, respectively.

Uniform Tauberian theorem for games with a saddle point.

Theorem 3 *Let* $\mathfrak{A}$ *and* $\mathfrak{B}$ *satisfy conditions* $(\mathcal{P})$, $(\diamond)$.

Assume that for each $\lambda, T, h > 0$, *for each of the following payoffs* v_T, $\hat{c}_{h,T}^{\mathcal{V}^\flat}$, w_λ, $\check{c}_{h,\lambda}^{\mathcal{W}^\flat}$ *the corresponding games have saddle points and* ε*-optimal player's strategies from* $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$ *respectively for all* $\varepsilon > 0$.

Then, the following limits exist, are uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$, *and coincide*

$$\lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \mathcal{V}_T^\sharp(\omega) = \lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \mathcal{V}_T^\flat(\omega) = \lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_\lambda^\sharp(\omega) = \lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_\lambda^\flat(\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega \tag{12}$$

if at least one of these limits exists, and is uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$.

For the proof of this theorem, refer to Sect. 4. The condition of existence of a saddle point can be relaxed, see Corollary 2, also in Sect. 4.

The conditions of Theorem 3 mostly deal with the value functions, however, a similar theorem can be formulated in terms of the capabilities of players. To this end, consider the following:

Additional conditions for capabilities' sets.

In addition to concatenation, let us also define time-shift. For a time $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$ and a process $z \in \mathbb{K}$, define the function $z_\tau : \mathbb{T} \mapsto \Omega$ by the following rule:

$$z_\tau(t) = z(t+\tau) \qquad \forall t \in \mathbb{T}. \tag{13}$$

We say that a family $\mathfrak{A}$ of playable strategies allows the separation of ω (at the initial time) if, for each mapping $\eta : \Omega \to \mathfrak{A}$,

$$\exists A \in \mathfrak{A}\ \forall \omega \in \Omega \qquad \eta(\omega) \cap \Gamma(\omega) = A \cap \Gamma(\omega).$$

Call a family $\mathfrak{A}$ closed under backward shift if, for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$, $\tau > 0$, there exists a $A' \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $A = A \diamond_\tau A'$. It is easy see that $A = A \diamond_\tau A'$ implies $\{z_\tau \,|\, z \in A\} \subset A'$.

We say that families $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ are compatible if, for all $\omega \in \Omega, A \in \mathbb{A}, B \in \mathbb{B}$, $A \cap B \cap \Gamma(\omega)$ is non-empty.

So, let us also define the following conditions:

$(\mathcal{C})$ $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ are compatible;

(ω) $\mathfrak{A}$ allows the separation of ω (at the initial time);

(τ) $\mathfrak{A}$ is closed under backward shift.

$(\mathcal{C})$ is a stronger variant of condition $(\mathcal{P})$; the former is relatively often used for the games with a saddle point, see, for example [8, Subsect. VIII.3]. We will use it in Lemma 4. Condition (ω) lets the player use the data on the initial ω; under this condition, we can always provide ε-optimal players' strategies (see Lemma 3). $(\diamond)\,\&\,(\omega)$ let the player plan the switch of strategies at a given time in advance, at the beginning of the game; the switch is based on the information about the state that would realize at the time of the switch. In particular, this switching can be used to construct, in the framework of the Tauberian theorem, the near-optimal strategies, see Remark 3 and (36), (50). Condition (τ) means that an action is admissible for this information at a positive time if this action is admissible for this information at zero time; below, we will only use this condition to prove Bellman's optimality principle (see Lemma 2).

Uniform Tauberian theorems for games without a saddle point.

Theorem 4 *Let $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ satisfy conditions $(\mathcal{C}), (\diamond), (\omega), (\tau)$.*

If, either for lower and upper games with payoffs v_T $(T > 0)$, or for lower and upper games with payoffs w_λ $(\lambda > 0)$, limits of their values (in (12)) exist, are uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$, and coincide, then, all limits in (12) exist, are uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$, and coincide.

Our main objective for two next Sections is to prove these theorems.

3 One-sided Tauberian theorems.

On game families. Below, we will consider various directed sets of payoffs, which we will index by positive numbers. For example, $w_\lambda \ (\lambda \downarrow 0)$, $v_T \ (T \uparrow \infty)$, $w_\lambda \ (\lambda \downarrow 0)$, $v_T \ (T \uparrow \infty)$, $\hat{c}^U_{h,T} \ (T \uparrow \infty)$, $\check{c}^U_{h,\lambda}(\lambda \downarrow 0)$ for some $h > 0$, $U : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$. For brevity, for all of these payoff families, we might also use the notation $\nu_\gamma \ (\gamma \to \gamma_*)$, with $\gamma > 0$, $\gamma_* \in \{0, +\infty\}$, and payoffs ν_γ. For all $\gamma > 0$, the set $[\gamma, \infty)$ (respectively, $(0, \gamma]$) is called a neighborhood of γ_* if $\gamma_* = +\infty$ (if $\gamma_* = 0$).

On guaranties and suboptimality principles. Consider functions $S : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, $U : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 4 *Let us say that a lower game (8a) (respectively, or (10a), or (10b)) has a guarantee S if $\mathbb{V}^\flat[c](\omega) \geq S(\omega)$ (respectively, or $\mathcal{V}^\flat_T(\omega) \geq S(\omega)$, or $\mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda(\omega) \geq S(\omega)$) for all $\omega \in \Omega$.*

Let us say that a guarantee S of lower game (8a) with payoff c is protected if there exists a strategy $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ satisfying $c(z) \geq S(z(0))$ for all $z \in A$.

Let us say that a lower game family with payoffs $\nu_\gamma(\gamma \to \gamma_*)$ has an asymptotic guarantee U (a protected asymptotic guarantee) if, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a neighborhood of γ_* such that $U_\gamma - \varepsilon$, as function from Ω to $\mathbb{R}$, is a guarantee (a protected guarantee) for lower game with payoff ν_γ for all γ from this neighborhood.

Note that each function $S : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ may be regarded as a function from $\mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \Omega$ to $\mathbb{R}$, which does not depend on the first argument; therefore, S may be an asymptotic guarantee.

Definition 5 *Let us say that a function $U : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a subsolution of the lower game family with payoffs $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$ if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive $\bar{T}$ such that, for all $h > 0, T > \bar{T}$, there exists a strategy $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that*

$$U_{T+h}(z(0)) - \varepsilon \leq \hat{c}^U_{h,T}(z) = \frac{1}{T+h} \int_0^h g(z(t))\, dt + \frac{T}{T+h} U_T(z(h)) \qquad \forall z \in A, \tag{14a}$$

i.e., for all $h > 0, T > \bar{T}$, the function $U_{T+h} - \varepsilon$ is a protected guarantee of the lower game with payoff $\hat{c}^U_{h,T}$.

Let us say that a function $U : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a subsolution of the lower game family with payoffs $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$ if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive $\bar{\lambda}$ such that, for all positive $\lambda < \bar{\lambda}$, for all $h > 0$, there exists a strategy $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that

$$U_\lambda(z(0)) - \varepsilon \leq \check{c}^U_{h,\lambda}(z) = \lambda \int_0^h e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + e^{-\lambda h} U_\lambda(z(h)) \qquad \forall z \in A, \tag{14b}$$

i.e., for all positive $\lambda < \bar{\lambda}$, for all $h > 0$, $U_\lambda - \varepsilon$ is a protected guarantee of lower game with payoff $\check{c}^U_{h,\lambda}$.

For a similar definition, refer to [8, Sect. VI.4], suboptimality principle [8, Definition III.2.31] (also referred to as 'stability with respect to second player' [33], and [8, Sect. VI.4] for discrete problems).

Remark 1 *Let a payoff family* $\nu_\gamma \ \ (\gamma \to \gamma_*)$ *be either* $v_T \ \ (T \uparrow \infty)$, *or* $w_\lambda \ \ (\lambda \downarrow 0)$, *Assume* U, U' *from* $\mathbb{R} \times \Omega$ *to* $\mathbb{R}$ *has a common limit as* $\gamma \to \gamma_*$, *and this limit is uniform on* Ω. *Then,*

1. U *is an asymptotic guarantee of the lower game family with payoffs* $\nu_\gamma(\gamma \to \gamma_*)$ *iff* U' *is the same;*

2. U *is a protected asymptotic guarantee of this lower game family iff* U' *is the same;*

3. U *is a subsolution of this lower game family iff* U' *is the same.*

One-sided Tauberian theorems for lower game families.

In Appendix B, we prove the following proposition:

Proposition 1 *Let* $\mathfrak{A}$ *satisfy conditions* $(\mathcal{P}), (\diamond)$.

Let a bounded from above function $U : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a subsolution for the lower game family with payoffs* $v_T (T \uparrow \infty)$, *in particular, let* $(14a)$ *hold.*

Let also U *satisfy*

$$\liminf_{T \uparrow \infty} \inf_{\omega \in \Omega} \big(U_{pT}(\omega) - U_T(\omega) \big) \geq 0 \qquad \forall p > 1. \tag{15a}$$

Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, *there exists a natural* N *such that, for all positive* $\lambda < 1/N$, *a function* $U_{1/\lambda} - \varepsilon$ *is a protected guarantee of the lower game with payoff* w_λ; *in particular,*

$$\mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda(\omega) \geq U_{1/\lambda}(\omega) - \varepsilon \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega, \lambda \in (0, 1/N).$$

In Appendix C, we prove the following proposition:

Proposition 2 *Let* $\mathfrak{A}$ *satisfy conditions* $(\mathcal{P}), (\diamond)$.

Let a bounded from above function $U : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a subsolution for the lower game family with payoffs* $w_\lambda (\lambda \downarrow 0)$, *in particular, let* $(14b)$ *hold.*

Let also U *satisfy*

$$\liminf_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \inf_{\omega \in \Omega} \big(U_\lambda(\omega) - U_{p\lambda}(\omega) \big) \geq 0 \qquad \forall p > 1. \tag{15b}$$

Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, *there exists a natural* N *such that, for all positive* $T > N$, *a function* $U_{1/T} - \varepsilon$ *is a protected guarantee of the lower game with payoff* v_T; *in particular,*

$$\mathcal{V}^\flat_T(\omega) \geq U_{1/T}(\omega) - \varepsilon \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega, T > N.$$

Note that $(15b)$ holds for U if either U is decreasing in λ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, or U has limit as $\lambda \downarrow 0$, and this limit is uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$, or U is a sum of such functions. Analogously, $(15a)$ holds for U if either U is increasing in T for all $\omega \in \Omega$ or U has limit as $T \uparrow \infty$, and this limit is uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$, or U is a sum of such functions.

The inequalities similar to $(15a)$ will be found in Uniform Tauberian Theorem, (see definitions of slowly decreasing, slowly varying, for example, in [10, Definition 4.1.4],[26, Sect.6.2]). For stochastic games the similar inequalities can see in [38] (Condition (3^*) from Theorem 4.1).

Note that, in addition to uniform and exponential payoff families, the Tauberian theorems can be formulated for arbitrary probability densities. The corresponding results are seen for discrete time systems [40],[44], for optimal control [36], for games [32]. In [32], it is made based on the corresponding One-sided Tauberian theorems similar to Propositions 1,2.

Corollary 1 *Let $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfy conditions $(\mathcal{P}), (\diamond)$. Let the functions $\mathcal{V}^\flat$, $\mathcal{W}^\flat$ be subsolutions for the lower game families with payoffs $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$ and with payoffs $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$, respectively.*

If there exists a limit of $\mathcal{V}^\flat_T$ that is uniform on Ω:

$$S_*(\omega) = \lim_{T \uparrow \infty} \mathcal{V}^\flat_T(\omega) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega,$$

then, this limit S_* is a common protected asymptotic guarantee for lower game families with payoffs $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$ and $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$.

If there exists a limit of $\mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda$ that is uniform on Ω:

$$S_*(\omega) = \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda(\omega) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega,$$

then, this limit S_* is a common protected asymptotic guarantee for lower game families with payoffs $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$ and $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$.

Proof of Corollary 1. Assume that there exists a limit of $\mathcal{V}^\flat_T$ that is uniform on Ω. The uniformity of this limit implies $(15a)$ for $U \equiv \mathcal{V}^\flat$, also, we see that $\mathcal{V}^\flat, S_*$ are asymptotic guaranties for the lower game family with payoffs $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$.

We claim that S_* is a protected asymptotic guarantee for the lower game family with w_λ. By condition, $\mathcal{V}^\flat$ is a subsolution for this lower game family. Therefore, S_* is the same by Remark 1. Now, by Proposition 1, S_* is a protected asymptotic guarantee for lower game family with payoffs w_λ.

The second part is proved analogously by Proposition 2, i.e., since S_* is an asymptotic guarantee for the lower game family with payoffs w_λ, S_* is also a protected asymptotic guarantee for the lower game family with v_T. By the first part of the proof, now S_* is a protected asymptotic guarantee for the lower game family with payoffs w_λ. The proof of the same fact for the payoff family v_T $(T \uparrow \infty)$ is similar. $\square$

4 Proofs of main results. Their corollaries.

Auxiliary lemmas. The formulations.

Similarly [8, Remark III.2.7], for continuous dynamic systems with payoff w_λ, we obtain:

Lemma 1 *Let the set $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfy conditions $(\mathcal{P}), (\diamond)$. Let ε, T, λ be positive. Then,*

1) $\mathbb{V}^\flat\big[\hat{c}^U_{h,T}\big] - \varepsilon$ is a guarantee of lower game with payoff v_{T+h} for all $h > 0$ if $U_T - \varepsilon$ is a protected guarantee of lower game with payoff v_T;

2) $\mathbb{V}^\flat\big[\check{c}^U_{h,\lambda}\big] - \varepsilon$ is a guarantee of lower game with payoff w_λ for all $h > 0$ if $U_\lambda - \varepsilon$ is a protected guarantee of lower game with payoff w_λ.

Lemma 2 *Let the set $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfy conditions $(\mathcal{P}), (\tau)$. Then,*

1) $\mathcal{V}^\flat$ is a subsolution for the lower game family with payoffs $v_T (T \uparrow \infty)$ if $\mathcal{V}^\flat$ is a protected asymptotic guarantee for this lower game family;

2) $\mathcal{W}^\flat$ is a subsolution for the lower game family with payoffs $w_\lambda (\lambda \downarrow 0)$ if $\mathcal{W}^\flat$ is a protected asymptotic guarantee for this lower game family.

We will also need the two lemmas that are essentially contained in [32, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 3 *Let the set $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfy conditions $(\mathcal{P}), (\omega)$. Let a mapping $c : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ be bounded. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{V}^\flat[c] - \varepsilon$ is a protected guarantee for lower game with payoff c.*

Lemma 4 *Let the sets $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$ satisfy condition $(\mathcal{C})$. Then, $\mathbb{V}^\flat[c] \le \mathbb{V}^\sharp[c]$ for a bounded payoff $c : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$.*

The proofs of all lemmas are located in Appendix A.

Note that, for a payoff family $\nu_\gamma \ (\gamma \to \gamma_*)$, if lower and upper game families with $\nu_\gamma(\gamma \to \gamma_*)$ have a common asymptotic guarantee $S_* : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, for all γ from some neighborhood of γ_*, we obtain

$$\mathbb{V}^\sharp[\nu_\gamma](\omega) - \varepsilon \le S_*(\omega) \le \mathbb{V}^\flat[\nu_\gamma](\omega) + \varepsilon \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega. \tag{16}$$

Conceptually, the proofs of Theorems 3,4 and their corollaries consist of the two parts. By checking the conditions of one of Propositions 1 and 2, we prove (16). Its converse inequality, in the case of Theorem 4, is based on Lemma 4 and, in the case of Theorem 3, on the existence of a saddle point for games with payoffs v_T, w_λ.

Proof of Theorem 3

By condition, $\mathcal{V}^\flat_T \equiv \mathcal{V}^\sharp_T$, $\mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda \equiv \mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda$ for all $\lambda, T > 0$. Therefore, for each $h, \lambda, T > 0$, the games with the payoff $\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\flat}_{h,T}$ and the games with the payoffs $\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}$ coincide completely. The same

is true for the pair of payoffs $\check{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\flat}_{h,T}$, $\check{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}$. Thus, we can consider the conditions of the theorem with respect to lower and upper games to be totally symmetric.

If at least one of limits from (12) exists and is uniform on Ω, then, either the limit of $\mathcal{V}^\flat_T = \mathcal{V}^\sharp_T$ as $T \uparrow \infty$, or the limit of $\mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda = \mathcal{W}^\sharp_\lambda$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ exists, and is uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$. Assume that it is the limit S_* of $\mathcal{V}^\flat_T$, $\mathcal{V}^\sharp_T$ as $T \uparrow \infty$.

We claim that S_* is a protected asymptotic guarantee for the lower game family with $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$.

Fix a $\varepsilon, T > 0$. By condition, we can find ε-optimal strategies for payoff v_T. So, $\mathcal{V}^\sharp_T + \varepsilon$ is a protected guarantee of upper game with payoff v_T. Using Lemma 1 for upper games, we obtain

$$\mathcal{V}^\sharp_{T+h} \le \mathbb{V}^\sharp\big[\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}\big] + \varepsilon$$

for all $h > 0$. By hypothesis, for each $h > 0$, there exists ε-optimal strategy $A^h \in \mathfrak{A}$ for payoff $\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}$; now,

$$\mathcal{V}^\sharp_{T+h}(z(0)) - 2\varepsilon \le \mathbb{V}^\flat\big[\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}\big](z(0)) - \varepsilon \le \hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}(z) \qquad \forall z \in A^h.$$

So, (14a) with $U = \mathcal{V}^\sharp$ holds for all positive h. Thus, $\mathcal{V}^\sharp$ is a subsolution of lower game family with payoffs v_T.

Then, by Proposition 1, $\mathcal{V}^\sharp$ is a protected asymptotic guarantee for lower game family with $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$. Now, by Remark 1, S_* is the same.

Analogously, by symmetry with respect to lower and upper games, one can prove that S_*, as the uniform limit of $\mathcal{V}^\sharp$, is a protected asymptotic guarantee for upper game family with $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$.

So, S_* is an asymptotic guarantee for lower and upper game families with $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$, i.e., (16) holds for this family. Now, by $\mathcal{W}^\sharp \equiv \mathcal{W}^\flat$, S_* is the limit of $\mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda$ and $\mathcal{W}^\sharp_\lambda$, and this limit is uniform.

The second part of the proof is very similar, it is only necessary to swap λ and T, v_T and w_λ everywhere, and use $\check{c}_{h,\lambda}$, Proposition 2 instead of $\hat{c}_{h,T}$, Proposition 1. □

Let us make Theorem 3 more precise. Recall that $\gamma_* \in \{0+, +\infty\}$.

Definition 6 *For payoff family ν_γ $(\gamma \to \gamma_*)$, let us say that this family has an asymptotic saddle point if the limit of $|\mathbb{V}^\flat[\nu_\gamma](\omega) - \mathbb{V}^\sharp[\nu_\gamma](\omega)|$ as $\gamma \to \gamma_*$ exists, is equal to 0, and is uniform for $\omega \in \Omega$.*

Definition 7 *For a monotonic function $\varkappa : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with $\varkappa(\gamma) \to 0$ as $\gamma \to \gamma_*$, let us say that $\varkappa$ is a precision of family of payoffs ν_γ $(\gamma \to \gamma_*)$ if the lower and upper games with the payoff ν_γ have $\varkappa(\gamma)$-optimal strategies for each player. Let us say that $\varkappa$ is a common precision for a set of payoff families if $\varkappa$ is a precision for each payoff family from this set.*

Remark 2 *Consider a family of payoffs* $\nu_\gamma \ \ (\gamma \to \gamma_*)$. *Any monotonic function* $\varkappa : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ *with* $\varkappa(\gamma) \to 0$ *as* $\gamma \to \gamma_*$ *is actually a precision of this family if all corresponding games have* ε*-optimal players' strategies for a positive* ε.

Corollary 2 *Let* $\mathfrak{A}$ *and* $\mathfrak{B}$ *satisfy conditions* $(\mathcal{P}), (\diamond)$. *Assume that both payoff families* $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$, $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$ *have a precision and an asymptotic saddle point. Also, for each of set of payoff families*

$$\{\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\flat}_{h,T}(T \uparrow \infty) \,|\, h > 0\}, \quad \{\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}(T \uparrow \infty) \,|\, h > 0\}, \quad \{\check{c}^{\mathcal{W}^\sharp}_{h,\lambda}(\lambda \downarrow 0) \,|\, h > 0\}, \quad \{\check{c}^{\mathcal{W}^\sharp}_{h,\lambda}(\lambda \downarrow 0) \,|\, h > 0\},$$

let there exist a common precision for this set.

Then, all limits in (12) *exist, are uniform in* $\omega \in \Omega$, *and coincide if at least one of these limits exists and is uniform in* $\omega \in \Omega$.

Proof of Corollary 2. By condition, the limit of $|\mathcal{V}^\flat_T(\omega) - \mathcal{V}^\sharp_T(\omega)|$ as $T \uparrow \infty$ and the limit of $|\mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda(\omega) - \mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda(\omega)|$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ equal 0 and are uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$.

Now, if at least one of limits in (12) exists, and is uniform on Ω, then, either the limit of $\mathcal{V}^\flat_T$ and $\mathcal{V}^\sharp_T$ as $T \uparrow \infty$, or the limit of $\mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda$ and $\mathcal{W}^\sharp_\lambda$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$, exists and is uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$. Assume that it is the limit S_* of $\mathcal{V}^\flat_T$ and $\mathcal{V}^\sharp_T$ as $T \uparrow \infty$.

By condition, there exists a precision function $\hat{\varkappa} : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with $\hat{\varkappa}(T) \to 0$ as $T \uparrow \infty$ such that, $|\mathcal{V}^\flat_T(\omega) - \mathcal{V}^\sharp_T(\omega)| < \hat{\varkappa}(T)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. As corollary, $|\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\flat}_{h,T}(z) - \hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}(z)| < \hat{\varkappa}(T)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{K}, h > 0$. In addition, by condition, increasing the function $\hat{\varkappa}$ if necessary (provided that $\hat{\varkappa}(+\infty) = 0$), we can propose that, for all $T, h > 0$, games with payoffs $\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}, \hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}$ also have $\hat{\varkappa}(T)$-optimal players' strategies. Now, we can consider the conditions of the theorem to be totally symmetric with respect to lower and upper games.

We claim that S_* is a protected asymptotic guarantee for lower game family with $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$. Fix a positive T. By condition, we can find $\hat{\varkappa}(T)$-optimal strategies for the payoff v_T. Using Lemma 1 for upper games, we obtain

$$\mathcal{V}^\sharp_{T+h} - \hat{\varkappa}(T) \le \mathbb{V}^\sharp\big[\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}\big] \qquad \forall h > 0.$$

By the choice of $\hat{\varkappa}$, for all $h > 0$, there exists $\hat{\varkappa}(T)$-optimal strategy $A^h \in \mathfrak{A}$ for payoff $\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}$; now

$$\mathcal{V}^\sharp_{T+h}(z(0)) - 2\hat{\varkappa}(T) \le \mathbb{V}^\flat\big[\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}\big](z(0)) - \hat{\varkappa}(T) \le \hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}(z) \qquad \forall z \in A^h.$$

So, (14a) with $U = \mathcal{V}^\sharp$ hold for all positive h. Thus, $\mathcal{V}^\sharp$ is a subsolution of lower game family with payoffs $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$. Now, by Remark 1, S_* is the same. By Proposition 1, S_* is a protected asymptotic guarantee for lower game family with payoffs $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$.

Analogously, by symmetry with respect to lower and upper games, one can prove that S_*, as the uniform limit of $\mathcal{V}^\sharp$, is a protected asymptotic guarantee for upper game family with $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$.

Now, S_* is an asymptotic guarantee for lower and upper game families with $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$, i.e., (16) holds for this family. Since $|\mathcal{W}^\sharp_\lambda(\omega) - \mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda(\omega)|$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ uniformly (on Ω) tends to 0, S_* is the limit of $\mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda$ and $\mathcal{W}^\sharp_\lambda$, and this limit is uniform.

The second part of the proof is analogous, it suffices to swap λ and T, v_T and w_λ, $\lambda \downarrow 0$ and $T \uparrow \infty$ everywhere and use $\check{c}_{h,\lambda}$, $\check{\varkappa}$, Proposition 2 instead of $\hat{c}_{h,T}$, $\hat{\varkappa}$, Proposition 1. $\square$

Note that the conditions of the corollary regarding the precision function can be relaxed. For example, in the case where the limit S_* of $\mathcal{V}^\flat_T$ (or $\mathcal{V}^\sharp_T$) as $T \uparrow \infty$ exists and is uniform on Ω, in Corollary 2, it is sufficient to provide the existence of a precision function for $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$ and common precisions for sets $\{\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\flat}_{h,T}(T \uparrow \infty) \,|\, h > 0\}$, $\{\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}(T \uparrow \infty) \,|\, h > 0\}$. Moreover, common precisions for sets $\{\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\flat}_{h,T}(T \uparrow \infty) \,|\, h > 0\}$, $\{\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}_{h,T}(T \uparrow \infty) \,|\, h > 0\}$, $\{\hat{c}^{S_*}_{h,T}(T \uparrow \infty) \,|\, h > 0\}$ can only exist simultaneously, i.e., it is sufficient to check any one of them.

On Tauberian theorem for abstract control system.

We can obtain the Tauberian theorem for abstract control system [41]. Following [41], assume the sets Ω, $\mathbb{K}$ to be given; moreover, assume $\mathbb{K}$ to be closed under concatenation and $\Gamma(\omega)$, defined as above, to be non-empty for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Set $\mathfrak{B} \triangleq \{\mathbb{K}\}$. Consider all the possible selectors of the multivalued mapping $\omega \mapsto \Gamma(\omega)$; let $\mathfrak{A}$ be the set of all possible images of these mappings. The closedness of $\mathbb{K}$ under concatenation implies the same for $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$. We can directly check that, for a bounded payoff, the corresponding games have saddle points and ε-optimal players' strategies for a positive ε. Therefore, by Corollary 1, we get the Tauberian theorem for abstract control system [41].

On Tauberian theorem for normal form games. Proof of Theorem 1

For all $l \in \mathfrak{L}$, $m \in \mathfrak{M}$, define $A_l \triangleq \big\{z[\omega, l, m'] \,\big|\, \omega \in \Omega, m' \in \mathfrak{M}\big\}$, $B_m \triangleq \big\{z[\omega, l', m] \,\big|\, \omega \in \Omega, l' \in \mathfrak{L}\big\}$. Set $\mathfrak{A} \triangleq \{A_l \,|\, l \in \mathfrak{L}\}, \mathfrak{B} \triangleq \{B_m \,|\, m \in \mathfrak{M}\}$. It is easy see that $A_l \cap B_m \cap \Gamma(\omega) = \{z[\omega, l, m]\} \neq \varnothing$ for all $l \in \mathfrak{L}$, $m \in \mathfrak{M}$, $\omega \in \Omega$. Thus, condition $(\mathcal{P})$ holds for $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$.

For each mapping $\zeta : \Omega \to \mathfrak{A}$, for each $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists a $l^\omega \in \mathcal{L}(\omega)$ such that $\zeta(\omega) \cap \Gamma(\omega) = A_{l^\omega} \cap \Gamma(\omega)$. Define $l^* \in \mathfrak{L}$ by the rule $l^*(\omega) \triangleq l^\omega(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Now, $A_{l^*} \in \mathfrak{A}$ satisfies $\zeta(\omega) \cap \Gamma(\omega) = A_{l^*} \cap \Gamma(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. So, condition (ω) holds for $\mathfrak{A}$. Analogously, it is easy to prove that $\mathfrak{B}$ is the same. Thus, the result of Lemma 3 holds.

Moreover, comparing (2a) and (7), we obtain that, for all $\tau > 0$, for all $A_{l'}, A_{l''} \in \mathfrak{A}$, there exists $A_l \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $A_l \cap \Gamma(\omega) = (A_{l'} \diamond_\tau A_{l''}) \cap \Gamma(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. So, $\mathfrak{A}$ is closed with respect to concatenation. Analogously, (2b) and (7) imply that $\mathfrak{B}$ is the same.

Now, comparing relations (3a), (3b) with relations (8a), (8b), (9), we obtain $\mathcal{V}^\flat \equiv \mathcal{V}^\natural \equiv \mathcal{V}^\sharp, \mathcal{W}^\flat \equiv \mathcal{W}^\natural \equiv \mathcal{W}^\sharp$, i.e., for all $\lambda, T > 0$, for each of the following payoffs v_T, w_λ, the corresponding games have saddle points. Comparing relations (3c), (3d) with relations (11a), (11b), we obtain the same for payoffs $\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\flat}_{h,T}$, $\check{c}^{\mathcal{W}^\flat}_{h,\lambda}$ for each $\lambda, T, h > 0$.

By Lemma 3, for each $\lambda, T, h > 0$, for each of the following payoffs v_T, $\hat{c}^{\mathcal{V}^\flat}_{h,T}$, w_λ, $\check{c}^{\mathcal{W}^\flat}_{h,\lambda}$, the

corresponding games have ε-optimal player's strategies from $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$ respectively for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

All conditions of Theorem 3 are verified. By this theorem we obtain what was needed. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.

Note that condition $(\mathcal{C})$ implies the result of Lemma 4. Therefore, $\mathbb{V}^\flat[c] \le \mathbb{V}^\sharp[c]$ for every bounded payoffs c. Then, it is sufficient to prove (16) for two payoff families: $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$ and $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$.

The condition (ω) implies the result of Lemma 3. By Remark 2, two payoff families $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$, $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$ have precisions.

By condition, one of both limits, either the common limit of $\mathcal{V}_T^\flat$ and $\mathcal{V}_T^\sharp$ as $T \uparrow \infty$, or the common limit of $\mathcal{W}_\lambda^\flat$ and $\mathcal{W}_\lambda^\sharp$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$, exists and is uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$. Denote this limit by S_*. The corresponding payoff family has a precision. Then, by Remark 1, S_* is a protected asymptotic guarantee for lower and upper game families with this payoff family.

Now, condition (τ) implies the result of Lemma 2 for this payoff family. By Remark 1, S_* is a subsolution for the corresponding game family. Then, by Corollary 1, S_* is a common protected asymptotic guarantee for both lower game families with payoffs $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$ and with payoffs $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$.

Because $\mathfrak{B}$ satisfies the same set of conditions as $\mathfrak{A}$ does, the assumptions of this Theorem with respect to lower and upper games are totally symmetric. Then, this limit S_* is a common protected asymptotic guarantee for upper game families with payoffs $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$ and payoffs $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$. This implies that (16) holds. $\square$

As follows from this proof, condition (ω) can be relaxed:

Corollary 3 *Let $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ satisfy conditions $(\mathcal{C}), (\diamond), (\tau)$.*

If payoff family $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$ has a precision and the limits of $\mathcal{V}_T^\flat, \mathcal{V}_T^\sharp$ (in (12)) exist as $T \uparrow \infty$, are uniform on Ω, and coincide, then all limits in (12) exist, are uniform on Ω, and coincide.

If payoff family $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$ has a precision and the limits of $\mathcal{W}_\lambda^\flat, \mathcal{W}_\lambda^\sharp$ (in (12)) exist as $\lambda \downarrow 0$, are uniform on Ω, and coincide, then all limits in (12) exist, are uniform on Ω, and coincide.

Moreover, in each of this cases, S_* is a common protected asymptotic guarantee for lower and upper game families with payoffs $v_T(T \uparrow 0)$ and $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$.

Remark 3 *Under conditions of Corollary 3, we can apply Remark 4 from Appendix A. Then, by Remark 5 from Appendix B and Remark 6 from Appendix C, the strategies that protect a guarantee S_* for one of the game families (with payoffs $v_T(T \uparrow 0)$ or $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$), are expressed (see $(36), (50)$) through such strategies for the other game family.*

On Tauberian theorem for normal form games. Proof of Theorem 2.

For all $l \in \mathfrak{L}$, $m \in \mathfrak{M}$, define $A_l \triangleq \{z[\omega, l, m'] \,|\, \omega \in \Omega, m' \in \mathfrak{M}\}$, $B_m \triangleq \{z[\omega, l', m] \,|\, \omega \in \Omega, l' \in \mathfrak{L}\}$. Set $\mathfrak{A} \triangleq \{A_l \,|\, l \in \mathfrak{L}\}, \mathfrak{B} \triangleq \{B_m \,|\, m \in \mathfrak{M}\}$. It is easy see that $A_l \cap B_m \cap \Gamma(\omega) = \{z[\omega, l, m]\} \neq \varnothing$ for all $l \in \mathfrak{L}$, $m \in \mathfrak{M}$, $\omega \in \Omega$. Thus, conditions $(\mathcal{P})$ and $(\mathcal{C})$ hold for $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$.

For each mapping $\zeta : \Omega \to \mathfrak{A}$, for each $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists a $l^\omega \in \mathcal{L}(\omega)$ such that $\zeta(\omega) \cap \Gamma(\omega) = A_{l^\omega} \cap \Gamma(\omega)$. Define $l^*(\omega) \triangleq l^\omega(\omega)$. Now, $\zeta(\omega) \cap \Gamma(\omega) = A_{l^*} \cap \Gamma(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Thus, condition (ω) holds for $\mathfrak{A}$. Analogously, it is easy prove that $\mathfrak{B}$ is the same.

For all $\tau > 0$, for all $l', l'' \in \mathfrak{L}$, $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{l'} \diamond_\tau A_{l''} &\overset{(7)}{=} \{z' \diamond_\tau z'' \,|\, z' \in A_{l'}, z'' \in A_{l''}, z'(\tau) = z''(0)\} \\
&= \{z[\omega, l', m'] \diamond_\tau z[\omega', l'', m''] \,|\, m', m'' \in \mathfrak{M}, \omega' = z[\omega, l', m'](\tau)\} \\
&\overset{(5a)}{=} \{z[\omega, l' \diamond_\tau l'', m' \diamond_\tau m''] \,|\, m', m'' \in \mathfrak{M}\} \\
&\overset{(5b)}{=} \{z[\omega, l' \diamond_\tau l'', m] \,|\, m \in \mathfrak{M}\} = A_{l' \diamond_\tau l''} \in \mathfrak{A}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, $\mathfrak{A}$ is closed with respect to concatenation. Moreover, by $(5b)$, for all $l' \in \mathfrak{L}$, there exists $l'' \in \mathfrak{L}$ satisfying $l' \diamond_\tau l'' = l'$. Then, $A_{l'} \diamond_\tau A_{l''} = A_{l'}$. So, $\mathfrak{A}$ is closed under backward shift. Analogously, it is easy prove that $\mathfrak{B}$ is the same.

Now, comparing relations $(6a), (6b)$ with relations $(8a), (8b), (9)$, we see that all conditions of Corollary 3 are verified. By this corollary we obtain what was required. □

5 Games for discrete setting

Game statement.

Recall that $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. Let a set $\bar{\Omega}$ be nonempty. Let $\bar{\mathbb{K}}$ be a set of admissible processes $\bar{y} : \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \to \Omega$. For all $\bar{\omega} \in \bar{\Omega}$, consider a set $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{\omega}) \triangleq \{\bar{y} \in \bar{\mathbb{K}} \,|\, \bar{y}(0) = \bar{\omega}\}$ of processes $\bar{y} \in \bar{\mathbb{K}}$ with $\bar{y}(0) = \bar{\omega}$. Let these sets be also non-empty for all $\bar{\omega} \in \bar{\Omega}$.

Again, the first player wishes to maximize a payoff function $c : \bar{\mathbb{K}} \to \mathbb{R}$; the second player wishes to minimize it. Players are given the sets $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$ of subsets of $\bar{\mathbb{K}}$, their sets of strategies. To ensure that the lower and upper games are well-defined, assume that, for each $\bar{\omega} \in \bar{\Omega}$, for all $\bar{A} \in \bar{\mathfrak{A}}, \bar{B} \in \bar{\mathfrak{A}}$, sets $\bar{A} \cap \bar{B} \cap \bar{\Gamma}(\bar{\omega})$ are non-empty.

Fix a function $\bar{g} : \bar{\Omega} \to [0, 1]$. For all $\mu \in (0, 1), n \in \mathbb{N}$, define payoffs $\bar{v}_n, \bar{w}_\mu$ as follows:

$$\bar{v}_n(\bar{y}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} \bar{g}(\bar{y}(t)) \in [0, 1], \quad \bar{w}_\mu(\bar{y}) = \mu \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (1 - \mu)^i \bar{g}(\bar{y}(t)) \in [0, 1] \qquad \forall \bar{y} \in \bar{\mathbb{K}}.$$

For simplicity, assume that, both for the payoffs $\bar{v}_n$ and payoffs w_μ, the corresponding

games have their saddle points, i.e., the following definitions are valid:

$$\overline{\mathcal{V}}_n(\bar\omega) = \sup_{\bar A\in\bar{\mathfrak{A}}}\inf_{\bar y\in\bar A\cap\bar\Gamma(\bar\omega)}\bar v_n(\bar y)=\inf_{\bar B\in\bar{\mathfrak{B}}}\sup_{\bar y\in\bar B\cap\bar\Gamma(\bar\omega)}\bar v_n(\bar y),\qquad \forall n\in\mathbb{N},\bar\omega\in\bar\Omega, \tag{17a}$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{W}}_\mu(\bar\omega) = \sup_{\bar A\in\bar{\mathfrak{A}}}\inf_{\bar y\in\bar A\cap\bar\Gamma(\bar\omega)}\bar w_\mu(\bar y)=\inf_{\bar B\in\bar{\mathfrak{B}}}\sup_{\bar y\in\bar B\cap\bar\Gamma(\bar\omega)}\bar w_\mu(\bar y)\qquad \forall\mu\in(0,1),\bar\omega\in\bar\Omega. \tag{17b}$$

We will also need a condition to guarantee the existence of near-optimal strategies for the players. For all $\varepsilon>0$, or, in the games with the payoffs w_μ $(\mu\in(0,1))$ for sufficiently small μ, or, respectively, the games with the payoffs v_n $(n\in\mathbb{N})$ for sufficiently large n, each player has ε-optimal strategies, i.e., for all $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $N\in\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\forall n>N\ \exists\bar A^{n,\varepsilon}\in\mathfrak{A},\bar B^{n,\varepsilon}\in\mathfrak{B}\ \forall\bar\omega\in\bar\Omega\quad \inf_{\bar y\in\bar A^{n,\varepsilon}\cap\bar\Gamma(\bar\omega)}\bar v_n(\bar y)+\varepsilon\ge\overline{\mathcal{V}}_n(\bar\omega)\ge\sup_{\bar y\in\bar B^{n,\varepsilon}\cap\bar\Gamma(\bar\omega)}\bar v_n(\bar y)-\varepsilon, \tag{18a}$$

$$\forall\mu\in(0,\tfrac{1}{N})\ \exists\bar A^{\mu,\varepsilon}\in\mathfrak{A},\bar B^{\mu,\varepsilon}\in\mathfrak{B}\ \forall\bar\omega\in\bar\Omega\quad \inf_{\bar y\in\bar A^{\mu,\varepsilon}\cap\bar\Gamma(\bar\omega)}\bar w_\mu(\bar y)+\varepsilon\ge\overline{\mathcal{W}}_\mu(\bar\omega)\ge\sup_{\bar y\in\bar B^{\mu,\varepsilon}\cap\bar\Gamma(\bar\omega)}\bar w_\mu(\bar y)-\varepsilon. \tag{18b}$$

Let, for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, for all $\bar y',\bar y''\in\bar{\mathbb{K}}$ with $\bar y'(n)=\bar y''(0)$, define their concatenation $\bar y'\diamond_\tau\bar y'':\mathbb{N}\to\bar\Omega$ by the rule:

$$(\bar y'\diamond_n\bar y'')(i)\triangleq\begin{cases}\bar y'(i), & i\le n, i\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\};\\ \bar y''(i-n), & i>n, i\in\mathbb{N}.\end{cases}$$

So, for all subsets $\bar A',\bar A''\subset\bar{\mathbb{K}}$ and a time $n\in\mathbb{N}$, define their concatenation $\diamond_n$ by

$$\bar A'\diamond_n\bar A''\ \triangleq\ \{\bar y'\diamond_n\bar y''\,|\,\bar y'\in\bar A',\bar y''\in\bar A'',\bar y''(n)=\bar y'(0)\}.$$

Let us say that $\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ is closed under concatenation and backward shift with integral time points if, for a natural $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and for $\bar A,\bar A'\in\mathfrak{A}$, we have $\bar A\diamond_n\bar A'\in\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\bar A=\bar A\diamond_n\bar A''$ for some $\bar A''\in\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Tauberian theorem for games with discrete time.

Theorem 5 *Let $\bar{\mathfrak{A}},\bar{\mathfrak{B}}$ be sets of strategies, and let they be closed under concatenation and backward shift with integral time points. Assume also that $\bar A\cap\bar B\cap\bar\Gamma(\bar\omega)$ for all $\bar\omega\in\bar\Omega,\bar A\in\bar{\mathfrak{A}},\bar B\in\bar{\mathfrak{B}}$.*

Let, for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $\mu\in(0,1)$, (17a)-(17b) hold, i.e., let all games with payoffs $\bar v_n,\bar w_\mu$ have saddle points.

If (18a) holds and the limit of $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_n$ exists as $n\to\infty$ and is uniform in $\bar\omega\in\bar\Omega$, then both limits

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\overline{\mathcal{V}}_n(\bar\omega)=\lim_{\mu\downarrow0}\overline{\mathcal{W}}_\mu(\bar\omega)\qquad\forall\bar\omega\in\bar\Omega \tag{19}$$

exist, are uniform on $\bar\Omega$, and coincide; moreover, (18a), (18b) hold.

On the other hand, if (18b) holds and the limit of $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_\mu$ exists as $\mu\downarrow0$, and is uniform in $\bar\omega\in\bar\Omega$, then both limits in (19) exist, are uniform on $\bar\Omega$, and coincide; moreover, (18a), (18b) hold.

Proof of Theorem 5. Reduction to general statement.

To each $t \geq 0$, assign the integral number $\lfloor t \rfloor$, the greatest number (from $\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$) not surpassing t. Now, for all $t \geq 0$, $\langle t \rangle \triangleq t - \lfloor t \rfloor \in [0,1)$ is the fractional part of t.

Define $S \triangleq [0,1), \Omega \triangleq \bar{\Omega} \times S = \bar{\Omega} \times [0,1)$. To each $\bar{y} \in \bar{\mathbb{K}}, s \in S$, assign $z[\bar{y},s] : \mathbb{T} \to \Omega$ by the rule: $z[\bar{y},s](t) = (\bar{y}(\lfloor t+s \rfloor), \langle t+s \rangle)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$. Set

$$\mathbb{K} \triangleq \{z[\bar{y},s] \,|\, \bar{y} \in \bar{\mathbb{K}}, s \in S\}.$$

Define $g(\bar{\omega},s) \triangleq \bar{g}(\bar{\omega})$ for all $\omega = (\bar{\omega},s) \in \Omega$. Then, for all $z[\bar{y},s] \in \mathbb{K}$, $g\big(z[\bar{y},s](t)\big) = \bar{g}\big(\bar{y}(\lfloor t+s \rfloor)\big)$.

Denote by $\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{B}$, respectively, the sets of all possible mappings of $S \ni s \to \xi(s) \in \bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $S \ni s \to \xi(s) \in \bar{\mathfrak{B}}$. For all $\xi \in \mathbb{A} \cup \mathbb{B}$, designate

$$Z[\xi] \triangleq \{z[\bar{y},s] \,|\, s \in S, \bar{y} \in \xi(s)\}, \quad \mathfrak{A} \triangleq \{Z[\xi] \,|\, \xi \in \mathbb{A}\}, \quad \mathfrak{B} \triangleq \{Z[\xi] \,|\, \xi \in \mathbb{B}\}.$$

Now, for all $(\bar{\omega},s) \in \Omega, A = Z[\xi_A] \in \mathfrak{A}, B = Z[\xi_B] \in \mathfrak{B}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\bar{\omega},s) &= \{z[\bar{y},s'] \,|\, \exists \bar{y} \in \bar{K}, s' \in S, \bar{y}(\lfloor s' \rfloor) = \bar{\omega}, \langle s' \rangle = s\} = \{z[\bar{y},s] \,|\, \bar{y} \in \bar{\Gamma}(\bar{\omega})\} \\ A \cap B \cap \Gamma(\bar{\omega},s) &= \{z[\bar{y},s'] \,|\, \bar{y} \in \xi_A(s) \cap \xi_B(s) \cap \bar{\Gamma}(\bar{\omega})\} \neq \varnothing. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, conditions $(\mathcal{P})$ and $(\mathcal{C})$ hold for $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$.

Proof of Theorem 5. Closedness with respect to concatenation and backward shift.

It is sufficient to examine the set $\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$.

To simplify the notation, for all $\bar{y}', \bar{y}'' \in \bar{\mathbb{K}}$ with $\bar{y}'(0) = \bar{y}''(0)$, set $\bar{y}' \diamond_0 \bar{y}'' \triangleq \bar{y}''$; now, $\bar{A}' \diamond_0 \bar{A}'' = \bar{A}''$ for all $\bar{A}', \bar{A}'' \in \bar{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Remember that, for all $\tau > 0$, one has $z' = z[\bar{y}',s'], z'' = z[\bar{y}'',s''] \in \mathbb{K}$; their concatenation $z' \diamond_\tau z''$ is defined if $z'(\tau) = z''(0)$. Now, $z'(\tau) = z''(0)$ iff $\langle \tau + s' \rangle = \langle s'' \rangle$, $\bar{y}'(\lfloor \tau + s' \rfloor) = \bar{y}''(\lfloor s'' \rfloor)$ hold; by $s'' \in S$, it is now equivalent to the pair of equalities: $\langle \tau + s' \rangle = s'', \bar{y}'(\lfloor \tau + s' \rfloor) = \bar{y}''(0)$. Also in this case, $\langle \tau + s' + t \rangle = \langle s'' + t \rangle, \lfloor \tau + s' + t \rfloor = \lfloor s'' + t \rfloor$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then, we see that $z[\bar{y}',s'] \diamond_\tau z[\bar{y}'',s'']$ is well-defined iff $z[\bar{y}',s'] \diamond_\tau z[\bar{y}'',s''] = (\bar{y}' \diamond_{\lfloor \tau + s' \rfloor} \bar{y}'', s')$, $s'' = \langle \tau + s' \rangle$ and $\bar{y}'(\lfloor \tau + s' \rfloor) = \bar{y}''(0)$ hold, i.e., $\bar{y}' \diamond_{\lfloor \tau + s' \rfloor} \bar{y}''$ is well-defined, and $s'' = \langle \tau + s' \rangle$.

So, for all $A' = Z[\xi'], A'' = Z[\xi''] \in \mathfrak{A}$, $\tau > 0$, define $\xi \in \mathbb{A}$ by the rule $\xi(s) \triangleq \xi'(s) \diamond_{\lfloor \tau + s \rfloor} \xi''(\langle \tau + s \rangle)$ for all $s \in S$. Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A' \diamond_\tau A'' &= \big\{ z' \diamond_\tau z'' \,\big|\, z' \in A', z'' \in A'', z'(\tau) = z''(0) \big\} \\ &= \big\{ z[\bar{y}',s'] \diamond_\tau z[\bar{y}'',s''] \,\big|\, s' \in S, \bar{y}' \in \xi'(s'), s'' = \langle \tau + s' \rangle, \bar{y}'' \in \xi''(s''), \bar{y}'(\lfloor \tau + s' \rfloor) = \bar{y}''(0) \big\} \\ &= \big\{ z[\bar{y}' \diamond_{\lfloor \tau + s' \rfloor} \bar{y}'', s'] \,\big|\, s' \in S, \bar{y}' \in \xi'(s'), \bar{y}'' \in \xi''(\langle \tau + s' \rangle), \bar{y}'(\lfloor \tau + s' \rfloor) = \bar{y}''(0) \big\} \\ &= \big\{ z[\bar{y},s] \,\big|\, s \in S, \bar{y} \in \xi'(s) \diamond_{\lfloor \tau + s \rfloor} \xi''(\langle \tau + s \rangle) \big\} \qquad (20) \\ &= \big\{ z[\bar{y},s] \,\big|\, s \in S, \bar{y} \in \xi(s) \big\} = Z[\xi] \in \mathfrak{A}, \end{aligned}$$

Thus, condition $(\diamond)$ proved.

Consider arbitrary $A = Z[\xi]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tau \in (n-1, n]$. For all $s \in S$, by condition, $\xi(s) = \xi(s) \diamond_{\lfloor \tau+s \rfloor} \bar{A}^{(s)}$ for some $\bar{A}^{(s)} \in \bar{\mathfrak{A}}$. Define $\xi^* \in \mathbb{A}$ by the rule $\xi^*(\langle \tau + s \rangle) = \bar{A}^{(s)}$ for all $s \in S$ (i.e. $\xi^*(s') = \bar{A}^{(s'+n-\tau)}$ for $s' \in [0, \tau-n+1)$, $\xi^*(s') = \bar{A}^{(s'+n-1-\tau)}$ for $s' \in [\tau-n+1, 1)$). Now, $\xi(s) = \xi(s) \diamond_{\lfloor \tau+s \rfloor} \xi^*(\langle \tau + s \rangle)$ for all $s \in S$. Then, $A^* \triangleq Z[\xi^*] \in \mathfrak{A}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} A \diamond_\tau A^* &\overset{(20)}{=} \left\{ z[\bar{y}, s] \,\middle|\, s \in S, \bar{y} \in \xi(s) \diamond_{\lfloor \tau+s \rfloor} \xi^*(\langle \tau + s \rangle) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ z[\bar{y}, s] \,\middle|\, s \in S, \bar{y} \in \xi(s) \right\} = Z[\xi] = A. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, condition (τ) is also proved.

Proof of Theorem 5. Payoffs' comparison.

Consider the following function $\mu : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to (0, 1)$: $\mu(\lambda) = 1 - e^{-\lambda}$ for all $\lambda > 0$. Note that $\mu(0+) = 0+$.

Fix a process $z \in \mathbb{K}$. Now, $z = z[\bar{y}, s]$ for some $\bar{y} \in \bar{\mathbb{K}}, s \in S$. In addition, for all $\bar{y} \in \bar{\mathbb{K}}, s \in S$ we can find such z.

Define $z' \triangleq z[\bar{y}, 0]$. Then, $z \equiv z'_s$ (see (13)) and $g(z(t-s)) = \bar{g}(\bar{y}(\lfloor t \rfloor)) = g(z'(t))$ for all $t \geq s$.

In addition, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\bar{v}_n(\bar{y}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} \bar{g}(\bar{y}(t)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_i^{i+1} g(z'(r))\, dr = \frac{1}{n} \int_0^n g(z'(r))\, dr = v_n(z'). \tag{21a}$$

Moreover, $\int_t^{t+1} \lambda e^{-\lambda r}\, dr = e^{-\lambda t} - e^{-\lambda(t+1)} = (1-\mu(\lambda))^t \mu(\lambda)$ for all $t \geq 0, \lambda > 0$; now,

$$\bar{w}_{\mu(\lambda)}(\bar{y}) \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mu(\lambda)(1-\mu(\lambda))^i \int_i^{i+1} g(z'(r))\, dr = \int_0^{\infty} \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z'(r))\, dr = w_\lambda(z'). \tag{21b}$$

Define $\hat{\eta}(T) \triangleq \frac{4}{T}$, $\check{\eta}(\lambda) \triangleq 2\lambda$ for all $T, \lambda > 0$. In Appendix A, we prove inequalities (23f); now, for all $T, \lambda > 0$, we obtain

$$|\bar{v}_{\lfloor T \rfloor + 1}(\bar{y}) - v_T(z)| \overset{(21a)}{=} |v_{\lfloor T \rfloor + 1}(z') - v_T(z'_s)| \overset{(23f)}{\leq} \hat{\eta}(T) \;\to\; 0 \quad \text{as } T \uparrow \infty; \tag{22a}$$

$$|\bar{w}_{\mu(\lambda)}(\bar{y}) - w_\lambda(z)| \overset{(21b)}{=} |w_\lambda(z') - w_\lambda(z'_s)| \overset{(23f)}{\leq} \check{\eta}(\lambda) \;\to\; 0 \quad \text{as } \lambda \downarrow 0. \tag{22b}$$

Consider the case where (18a) holds and the limit of $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_n$ (in (19)) exists and is uniform on $\bar{\Omega}$. Then, (22a) implies that limits of $\mathcal{V}^\flat_T$ and $\mathcal{V}^\sharp_T$ (from (12)) exist and are uniform on Ω. Moreover, by (22a), (18a) implies that the payoff family $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$ has the precision $2\hat{\eta}$. Now, by Corollary 3, all limits in (12) exist, are uniform on Ω, and coincide. Then, by (22a)-(22b), all limits in (19) exist, are uniform on $\bar{\Omega}$, and coincide. Moreover, S_* is a common protected asymptotic guarantee for lower and upper game families with payoffs $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$. By (22$b$) and $\check{\eta}(\lambda) \to 0+$, it follows (18$b$).

The case where the limit of $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_\mu$ exists and is uniform on $\bar{\Omega}$ is analyzed analogously. $\square$

References

[1] Alvarez O, Bardi M (2007) Ergodic problems in differential games. In: Advances in dynamic game theory. Birkhäuser, Boston. pp.131-152

[2] Alvarez O, Bardi M (2010) Ergodicity, stabilization, and singular perturbations for Bellman-Isaacs equations. Mem Am Math Soc 960:1-90

[3] Arisawa M (1998) Ergodic problem for the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation II. Ann Inst Henri Poincare 15:1-24

[4] Arisawa M, Lions P (1998) On ergodic stochastic control. Com in partial differential equations 23(11-12):2187-2217

[5] Artstein Z, Bright I (2010) Periodic optimization suffices for infinite horizon planar optimal control. SIAM J Control Optim 48(8):4963-4986

[6] Artstein Z, Gaitsgory V (2000) The value function of singularly perturbed control systems. Appl Math Optim 41(3):425-445

[7] Bardi M (2009) On differential games with long-time-average cost. In: Advances in dynamic games and their applications. Birkhäuser, Boston. pp. 3-18

[8] Bardi M, Capuzzo-Dolcetta I (1997) Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. Birkhauser, Boston. xviii+570 pp.

[9] Bettiol P (2005) On ergodic problem for Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equations. ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations 11(04):522-541.

[10] Bingham NH, Goldie CM, Teugels JL (1989) Regular variation. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge. xx+494 pp.

[11] Blackwell D (1962) Discrete dynamic programming, Ann Math Statist 33(2):719-726

[12] Buckdahn R, Cardaliaguet P, Quincampoix M (2011) Some Recent Aspects of Differential Game Theory. Dyn Games Appl 1(1):74-114

[13] Buckdahn R, Goreac D, Quincampoix M (2014) Existence of asymptotic values for nonexpansive stochastic control systems. Appl Math Optim 70(1):1-28

[14] Cardaliaguet P. (2010) Ergodicity of Hamilton-Jacobi equations with a non coercive non convex Hamiltonian in $\mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$. Ann. l'Inst. Henri Poincare(C) Non Linear Anal 27(3):837-856.

[15] Cardaliaguet P, Laraki R, Sorin S (2012) A Continuous Time Approach for the Asymptotic Value in Two-Person Zero-Sum Repeated Games. SIAM J Cont Optim 50:1573-1596

[16] Carlson DA, Haurie AB, Leizarowitz A (1991) Optimal Control on Infinite Time Horizon. Springer, Berlin. xvi+332 pp.

[17] Chentsov AG (1981) On an alternative in a class of quasistrategies for a differential approach-evasion game. Differential Equations 16(10):1167-1171

[18] Chentsov AG, Subbotin AI (1981) Optimization of guarantee in control problems. Nauka, Moscow. 287 pp. (in Russian)

[19] Elliott RJ (1977) Feedback strategies in deterministic differential games. In: Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci, Vol 3, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York. pp.136-142.

[20] Elliott RJ, Kalton N (1972) The existence of value for differential games. Memoir of the American Mathematical Society, vol 126. AMS, Providence, iv+67 pp.

[21] Gaitsgory V (1985) Application of the averaging method for constructing suboptimal solutions of singularly perturbed problems of optimal control. Avtomat i Telemekh. 9:22-30

[22] Gaitsgory V, Quincampoix M (2009) Linear programming approach to deterministic infinite horizon optimal control problems with discounting. SIAM J Control Optim 48(4):2480-2512

[23] Gaitsgory V, Quincampoix M (2013) On sets of occupational measures generated by a deterministic control system on an infinite time horizon. Nonlinear Analysis:Theory, Methods & Applications 88:27-41

[24] Ghosh MK, Rao KSM (2005) Differential games with ergodic payoff. SIAM J Control Optim 43:2020-2035

[25] Grune L (1998) On the Relation between Discounted and Average Optimal Value Functions. J Diff Eq 148:65-99

[26] Hardy GH (1949) Divergent series. Clarendon Press, Oxford. xvi+396 pp.

[27] Hardy GH, Littlewood JE (1914) Tauberian theorems concerning power series and Dirichlet's series whose coefficients are positive. Proc London Math Soc. 13:174-191

[28] Karamata J (1930) Sur un mode de croissance reguliere des fonctions. Mathematica(Cluj) 4:38-53

[29] Khlopin DV (2014) A uniform Tauberian theorem for abstract game. In: Abstracts of IV international school-seminar 'Nonlinear analysis and extremal problems', Irkutsk, Russia, June 22-28, 2014. p.59

[30] Khlopin DV (2014) A uniform Tauberian theorem for conflict-controlled system. In: Abstracts of International Conference 'Systems Dynamics and Control Processes' dedicated to the 90th Anniversary of N.N.Krasovskii, Ekaterinburg, Russia, September 15-22, 2014. p.204-206 (in Russian)

[31] Khlopin DV (2015) Uniform Tauberian theorem for differential games. Mat Teor Igr Prilozh 1:92-120 (In Russian).

[32] Khlopin DV (2015) On Asymptotic Value for Dynamic Games with Saddle Point. Eds: C.Bonnet, B.Pasik-Duncan, H.Ozbay and Q.Zhang. 2015 Proceedings of the Conference on Control and Its Applications, SIAM, p.282-289. arXiv:1501.06993, doi:10.1137/1.9781611974072.39

[33] Krasovskii NN, Subbotin AI (1974) Positional differential games. Moscow: Nauka. 456 pp. (in Russian)

[34] Krasovskii NN, Subbotin AI (1988) Game-Theoretical Control Problems. Springer, New York xii+517 pp.

[35] Lehrer E, Sorin S (1992) A uniform Tauberian theorem in dynamic programming. Math Oper Res 17(2):303-307

[36] Li X, Quincampoix M, Renault J (2015) Limit value for optimal control with general means. arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.05238

[37] Lions P, Papanicolaou G, Varadhan SRS. Homogenization of Hamilton- Jacobi Equations, unpublished work.

[38] Mertens JF, Neyman A (1981) Stochastic Games. Int J of Game Theory 10(2):53-66

[39] Mertens JF, Neyman A (1982) Stochastic games have a value. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 79(6):2145-2146.

[40] Monderer D, Sorin S (1993) Asymptotic properties in Dynamic Programming. Int J of Game Theory 22:1-11

[41] Oliu-Barton M, Vigeral G (2013) A uniform Tauberian theorem in optimal control. In: Advances in Dynamic Games. Birkhäuser, Boston, pp.199-215.

[42] Quincampoix M, Renault J (2011) On the existence of a limit value in some non expansive optimal control problems. SIAM J Control Optim 49(5):2118-2132

[43] Renault J (2011) Uniform value in dynamic programming. J Eur Math Soc 13:309-330

[44] Renault J (2014) General limit value in Dynamic Programming. J. of Dyn and Games 1:471-484

[45] Renault J, Ziliotto B (2014) Hidden stochastic games and limit equilibrium payoffs. arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.3028.

[46] Ryll-Nardzewski C (1964) A theory of pursuit and evasion. In Advances in Game Theory. Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 113-126.

[47] Sorin S (2011) Zero-sum repeated games: recent advances and new links with differential games. Dynamic Games and Applications 1(1):172-207

[48] Subbotin AI (1995) Generalized solutions of first order PDEs. Birkhauser, Boston. xii+312 pp

[49] Vigeral G (2013) A zero-sum stochastic game with compact action sets and no asymptotic value. Dyn. Games and Appl 3:172–186

[50] Ziliotto B. (2015) A Tauberian theorem for nonexpansive operators and applications to zero-sum stochastic games. arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.06525.

A Auxiliary facts. The proofs of lemmas.

Let $\nu_\gamma(\gamma \to \gamma_*)$ be one of the payoff families, either $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$, or $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$,

For all $h > 0$, under $\nu_\gamma = v_T$, set $\gamma = T, \gamma_h = T + h$, $\sigma_{h,\gamma} = \frac{T}{T+h} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma_h}$, $\rho_\gamma|_{[0,\gamma]} \equiv \frac{1}{\gamma}$, $\rho_\gamma|_{(\gamma,\infty)} \equiv 0$; under $\nu_\gamma = w_\lambda$, set $\gamma = \lambda, \gamma_h = \lambda$, $\sigma_{h,\gamma} = e^{-\lambda h}$, $\rho_\gamma(t) = \lambda e^{-\lambda t}$ for all $t \geq 0$.

For a function $U : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, for all $h > 0$, we can define a payoff family by the following rule:

$$c^U_{h,\gamma}(z) \triangleq \int_0^h \rho_{\gamma_h}(t) g(z(t))\, dt + \sigma_{h,\gamma} U_\gamma(z(h)) \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{K} \quad (\gamma \to \gamma_*). \tag{23a}$$

Then, by (11a), (11b), $c^U_{h,T} \equiv \hat{c}^U_{h,T}$ if $\nu_\gamma \equiv v_T$, and $c^U_{h,\gamma} \equiv \check{c}^U_{h,\lambda}$ if $\nu_\gamma \equiv w_\lambda$.

Note several useful properties: for all $\gamma, h > 0, T \geq 0, z \in \mathbb{K}, z' \in \Gamma(z(h))$

$$\rho_{\gamma_h}(h+T) = \sigma_{h,\gamma}\rho_\gamma(T), \quad \nu_\gamma(z) = \int_0^\infty \rho_\gamma(t) g(z(t))\, dt; \tag{23b}$$

$$\max(0, 1 - h\rho_\gamma(0)) < \sigma_{h,\gamma} < 1, \quad \int_0^\infty \rho_\gamma(t)\ dt = 1; \tag{23c}$$

$$h\rho_\gamma(0) \geq \int_0^h \rho_{\gamma_h}(t) z(t)\ dt \overset{(23b)}{=} \nu_{\gamma_h}(z) - \int_0^\infty \sigma_{h,\gamma}\rho_\gamma(t) z(t+h)\ dt \overset{(13)}{=} \nu_{\gamma_h}(z) - \sigma_{h,\gamma}\nu_\gamma(z_h); \tag{23d}$$

$$c^U_{h,\gamma}(z) \overset{(23a)}{=} \int_0^h \rho_{\gamma_h}(t) g(z(t))\, dt + \sigma_{h,\gamma} U_\gamma(z(h)) \overset{(23a)}{=} c^U_{h,\gamma}(z \diamond_h z'). \tag{23e}$$

We claim also that for every $z \in \mathbb{K}, s, r \in [0,1], \lambda, T > 0$, one has

$$|w_\lambda(z) - w_\lambda(z_s)| \leq 2\lambda, \qquad |v_{T+r}(z) - v_T(z_s)| \leq \frac{4}{T}. \tag{23f}$$

Indeed, let $\nu_\gamma(\gamma \to \gamma_*)$ be one of the payoff families, either $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$, or $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$. For all $z \in \mathbb{K}, \gamma > 0, h \in [0,1)$, we obtain

$$|\nu_{\gamma_h}(z) - \nu_\gamma(z_h)| \overset{(23d)}{=} \Big| \int_0^h \rho_{\gamma_h}(t) z(t)\, dt \Big| + (1 - \sigma_{h,\gamma})\nu_\gamma(z_h) \overset{(23d)}{\leq} h\rho_\gamma(0) + |1 - \sigma_{h,\gamma}| \overset{(23c)}{\leq} 2\varrho_\gamma(0). \tag{24a}$$

Now, to get the first inequality from $(23f)$, it is sufficient to make a substitution $\gamma = \lambda, \nu_\gamma = w_\lambda, h = r$ in $(24a)$.

It remains to consider the case $\gamma = T, \nu_\gamma = v_T$. Recall that, in this case, $\rho_\gamma|_{[0,\gamma]} \equiv \frac{1}{\gamma}$, $\rho_\gamma|_{(\gamma,\infty)} \equiv 0$. Now, for all $h \in [0,1]$, we have $\gamma_h = \gamma + h$,

$$\int_0^\infty |\rho_\gamma(t) - \rho_{\gamma+h}(t)|\ dt \leq \Big(\frac{1}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{\gamma+h}\Big) \int_0^\gamma dt + \frac{1}{\gamma+h} \int_\gamma^{\gamma+h} dt = \frac{2h}{\gamma+h} \leq \frac{2}{\gamma} = 2\rho_\gamma(0). \tag{24b}$$

Now, for all $r, s \in [0,1]$, we have $h = |\gamma_r - \gamma_s| \leq 1$. Then,

$$|\nu_{\gamma_r}(z) - \nu_\gamma(z_s)| \overset{(24a)}{\leq} |\nu_{\gamma_r}(z) - \nu_{\gamma_s}(z)| + 2\varrho_\gamma(0) \overset{(24b)}{\leq} 4\varrho_\gamma(0),$$

and, to get the second inequality from $(23f)$, it suffices to substitute $\gamma = T, \nu_\gamma = v_T, h = r$ into the relation obtained. So, $(23f)$ holds.

Proof of Lemma 1. Let the set $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfy conditions $(\mathcal{P}), (\diamond)$. Let $\nu_\gamma(\gamma \to \gamma_*)$ be one of the payoff families, either $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$, or $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$. Fix $\gamma, \varepsilon > 0$.

Let $U_\gamma - \varepsilon$ be a protected guarantee of the lower game with the payoff ν_γ, i.e, let there exist a strategy $A^\gamma \in \mathfrak{A}$ satisfying

$$U_\gamma(z(0)) \leq \nu_\gamma(z) + \varepsilon \qquad \forall z \in A^\gamma. \tag{25}$$

We must prove that $\mathbb{V}^\flat\big[c^U_{h,\gamma}\big] - \sigma_{h,\gamma}\varepsilon$ is a guarantee of the lower game with the payoff ν_{γ_h} for all $h > 0$.

Fix $h, \delta > 0, \omega \in \Omega$. There exists a strategy $A'_\omega \in \mathfrak{A}$ satisfying

$$\mathbb{V}^\flat[c^U_{h,\gamma}](\omega) - \delta \le c^U_{h,\gamma}(z) \quad \forall z \in A'_\omega \cap \Gamma(\omega).$$

By (23e) and (7), every $z \in (A'_\omega \diamond_h A^\gamma) \cap \Gamma(\omega)$ also satisfies this inequality and $z_h \in A^\gamma$; now, for all $z \in (A'_\omega \diamond_h A^\gamma) \cap \Gamma(\omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{V}^\flat[c^U_{h,\gamma}](\omega) - \delta \le c^U_{h,\gamma}(z) &\overset{(23a)}{=} \int_0^h \rho_{\gamma_h}(t) g(z(t))\, dt + \sigma_{h,\gamma} U_\gamma(z(h)) \\
&\overset{(23d)}{=} \nu_{\gamma_h}(z) - \sigma_{h,\gamma}\nu_\gamma(z_h) + \sigma_{h,\gamma} U_\gamma(z_h(0)) \\
&\overset{(25)}{\le} \nu_{\gamma_h}(z) + \sigma_{h,\gamma}\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

By condition $(\diamond)$, we have $A'_\omega \diamond_h A^\gamma \in \mathfrak{A}$. Then, since the choice of $z \in (A'_\omega \diamond_h A^\gamma) \cap \Gamma(\omega)$ was arbitrary, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{V}^\flat[c^U_{h,\gamma}](\omega) - \sigma_{h,\gamma}\varepsilon - \delta &\le \inf_{z \in (A'_\omega \diamond_h A^\gamma) \cap \Gamma(\omega)} \nu_{\gamma_h}(z) \\
&\le \sup_{A \in \mathfrak{A}} \inf_{z \in A \cap \Gamma(\omega)} \nu_{\gamma_h}(z) = \mathbb{V}^\flat[\nu_{\gamma_h}](\omega) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, since the positive δ was chosen arbitrarily, we have $\mathbb{V}^\flat\big[c^U_{h,\gamma}\big] - \sigma_{h,\gamma}\varepsilon \le \mathbb{V}^\flat[\nu_{\gamma_h}]$ for all $h > 0$. □

Proof of Lemma 2.

Let the set $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfy conditions $(\mathcal{P}), (\tau)$. Let $\nu_\gamma(\gamma \to \gamma_*)$ be one of the payoff families, either $v_T(T \uparrow \infty)$, or $w_\lambda(\lambda \downarrow 0)$. Set $U_\gamma(\omega) \triangleq \mathbb{V}^\flat\big[\nu_\gamma\big](\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, $\gamma > 0$. Let U be a protected asymptotic guarantee for the lower game family with payoffs $\nu_\gamma(\gamma \to \gamma_*)$. We must prove that U is a subsolution for this lower game family.

By condition, there exists a monotonic function $\varkappa : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with $\varkappa(\gamma) \to 0+$ as $\gamma \to \gamma_*$ such that $U_\gamma - \varkappa(\gamma)$ is a protected guarantee for the lower game with ν_γ for all $\gamma > 0$.

Consider arbitrary $\gamma, h > 0, A' \in \mathfrak{A}, z' \in A'$. Note that, by (τ), A' may be expressed as $A' = A' \diamond_h A''$ for some $A'' \in \mathfrak{A}$. Now, there exists a $z'' \in A'' \cap \Gamma\big(z'(h)\big)$ such that

$$\nu_\gamma(z'') - \varkappa(\gamma) \le \inf_{z \in A'' \cap \Gamma(z'(h))} \nu_\gamma(z) \le \mathbb{V}^\flat\big[\nu_\gamma\big](z'(h)) = U_\gamma(z'(h)) \tag{26}$$

Set $z \triangleq z' \diamond_h z''$; by $z_h = z'_h = z''$ (see (13)), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
c^U_{h,\gamma}(z') &\overset{(23e)}{=} \int_0^h \varrho_{\gamma_h} g(z(t))\, dt + \sigma_{h,\gamma} U_\gamma(z(h)) \\
&\overset{(26)}{\ge} \int_0^h \varrho_{\gamma_h} g(z(t))\, dt + \sigma_{h,\gamma}\nu_\gamma(z_h) - \sigma_{h,\gamma}\varkappa(\gamma) \\
&\overset{(23d)}{=} \nu_{\gamma_h}(z) - \sigma_{h,\gamma}\varkappa(\gamma) \overset{(23c)}{\ge} \nu_{\gamma_h}(z) - \varkappa(\gamma).
\end{aligned}$$

So, to each $z' \in A'$, assign $z = z' \diamond_h z'' \in A' \diamond_h A'' = A'$ with $z'(0) = z(0)$ and $c^U_{h,\gamma}(z') \geq \nu_{\gamma_h}(z) - \varkappa(\gamma)$. Thus, we have

$$\inf_{z' \in A' \cap \Gamma(\omega)} c^U_{h,\gamma}(z') + \varkappa(\gamma) \geq \inf_{z' \in A' \cap \Gamma(\omega)} \nu_{\gamma_h}(z) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega, A' \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Recall that, for all $\gamma, h > 0$, $U_{\gamma_h} - \varkappa(\gamma_h)$ is a protected guarantee for the lower game with payoff ν_{γ_h}. Then, $U_{\gamma_h} - \varkappa(\gamma) - \varkappa(\gamma_h)$ is a protected guarantee for lower game with $c^U_{h,\gamma}$ for all $h, \gamma > 0$. By $\varkappa(\gamma_h) \leq \varkappa(\gamma)$, we obtain that $U_{\gamma_h} - 2\varkappa(\gamma)$ is a protected guarantee for lower game with $c^U_{h,\gamma}$ for all $h, \gamma > 0$.

Since $\varkappa(\gamma)$ tends to 0 as $\gamma \to \gamma_*$, U is a subsolution for lower game with payoff $\nu_\gamma(\gamma \to \gamma_*)$. □

Remark 4 *As follows from this proof, under condition* (τ), $\varkappa(\gamma)$*-optimal strategies for payoff* ν_{γ_h} *protect the corresponding asymptotic guarantee for games with* $c^U_{h,\gamma}$.

Proof of Lemma 3.

Let $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfy conditions $(\mathcal{P}), (\omega)$. Let a mapping $c : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ be bounded. We must prove that, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{V}^\flat[c] - \varepsilon$ is a protected guarantee for the lower game with payoff c.

Indeed, for $\varepsilon > 0$, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists a $A^\omega \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $c(z) > \mathbb{V}^\flat[c](\omega) - \varepsilon$ for all $z \in A^\omega \cap \Gamma(\omega)$. Set $\eta : \Omega \to \mathfrak{A}$ as follows: $\eta(\omega) = A^\omega$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. By condition (ω), there exists a strategy $A^* \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $A^* \cap \Gamma(\omega) = \eta(\omega) \cap \Gamma(\omega) = A^\omega \cap \Gamma(\omega)$. Then, $c(z) \geq \mathbb{V}^\flat[c](\omega) - \varepsilon$ for all $z \in A^* \cap \Gamma(\omega)$, $\omega \in \Omega$, i.e. $\mathbb{V}^\flat[c] - \varepsilon$ is a protected guarantee. □

Proof of Lemma 4.

Let $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$ satisfy condition $(\mathcal{C})$, let the payoff $c : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ be bounded. We claim that $\mathbb{V}^\flat[c] \leq \mathbb{V}^\sharp[c]$.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, $\omega \in \Omega$. There exists $A^\omega \in \mathfrak{A}, B^\omega \in \Omega$ such that $c(z') > \mathbb{V}^\flat[c](\omega) - \varepsilon$, $c(z'') < \mathbb{V}^\sharp[c](\omega) + \varepsilon$ for all $z' \in A^\omega \cap \Gamma(\omega), z'' \in B^\omega \cap \Gamma(\omega)$. By condition $(\mathcal{C})$, there exists $z \in A^\omega \cap B^\omega \cap \Gamma(\omega)$. Then, $\mathbb{V}^\flat[c](\omega) - \varepsilon < c(z) < \mathbb{V}^\sharp[c](\omega) + \varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > 0, \omega \in \Omega$ were chosen arbitrarily, we get $\mathbb{V}^\flat[c] \leq \mathbb{V}^\sharp[c]$. □

B A guarantee for $\mathcal{V}^\flat$ as a guarantee for $\mathcal{W}^\flat$. The proof of Proposition 1.

Step 1. Preliminary constructions and estimates.

Notice that U is bounded from above by a positive R.

It is easy to verify that $\ln p < p - 1 < p \ln p$ if $p > 1$. To each natural number $k > 2$, we can assign a number $p \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{k} < \frac{\ln k}{k} < \ln p < p - 1 < p \ln p < \frac{2 \ln k}{k}. \tag{27}$$

Fix such k, p.

Now, S is a subsolution, therefore for some $\hat{T}^{(k)} > 0$, we have $(14a)$: for all positive T, δ with $T > 2\hat{T}^{(k)}, \delta < T/2$, there exists a strategy $A^{T,\delta} \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that, for all $z \in A^{T,\delta}$,

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(z(0)) - \frac{1}{k^2} &\leq \frac{1}{T}\int_0^\delta g(z(t))\,dt + \frac{T-\delta}{T} U_{T-\delta}(z(\delta)) \\ &\overset{(23d)}{=} v_T(z) - \frac{T-\delta}{T}\Big(v_{T-\delta}(z_\delta) - U_{T-\delta}\big(z(\delta)\big)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Moreover, by $(15a)$, we also can choose $\hat{T}^{(k)}$ such that

$$U_T(\omega) \geq U_{p^{-1}T}(\omega) - \frac{1}{k^2} \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega, T > 2\hat{T}^{(k)}. \tag{29}$$

Fix such T. Define

$$\lambda \triangleq \frac{1}{T}, \quad \delta \triangleq \frac{T(p-1)}{p}, \quad \tau_i \triangleq i\delta \qquad \forall i \in \overline{0,k}.$$

Then,

$$\frac{T-\delta}{T} = p^{-1}, \quad \frac{\delta}{T\ln p} = \frac{p-1}{p\ln p} \overset{(27)}{\leq} 1, \tag{30}$$

$$\frac{p\delta}{T\ln p} \overset{(30)}{\leq} p \overset{(27)}{\leq} 1 + \frac{2\ln k}{k} = \frac{1}{\lambda T} + \frac{2\ln k}{k}, \qquad \frac{\ln p}{\delta} \overset{(30)}{\geq} \frac{1}{T} = \lambda. \tag{31}$$

Step 2. Constructing a near-w_λ payoff.

Define a piecewise constant function ϱ on $[0, \tau_k)$ by the rule

$$\varrho(t) = p^{-i} \qquad \forall t \in [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}). \tag{32}$$

Then, for $t \in [0, \tau_k)$, we have $t \in [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$ for some i, and

$$\varrho(t) = p^{-i} = p^{1-\tau_{i+1}/\delta} \leq p^{1-t/\delta}. \tag{33}$$

Consider a lower game with the following payoff:

$$c(z) \triangleq \frac{1}{T}\int_0^{\tau_k} \varrho(t) g(z(t))dt + p^{-k} U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\tau_k)) \qquad \forall z \in \mathbb{K}.$$

Note that, by $U_{p^{-1}T} \leq R$, we have

$$p^{-k}U_{p^{-1}T}(\omega) \leq p^{-k}R = e^{-k\ln p}R \overset{(27)}{\leq} e^{-\ln k}R = \frac{R}{k} \overset{(27)}{\leq} \frac{R\ln k}{k}.$$

Now, by $0 \leq g \leq 1$, for every process $z \in \mathbb{K}$,

$$c(z) - w_\lambda(z) \overset{(33)}{\leq} \frac{1}{T}\int_0^\infty [p^{1-t/\delta} - e^{-\lambda t}]dt + \frac{R\ln k}{k} = \frac{p\delta}{T\ln p} - \frac{1}{\lambda T} + \frac{R\ln k}{k} \overset{(31)}{\leq} \frac{(R+2)\ln k}{k}. \tag{34}$$

Step 3. Constructing the strategy A^*.

Remember that $T > 2\hat{T}^{(k)}$, $\delta = (1-p^{-1})T < T/2$ by choices of T and p respectively. Then, (28) holds for some $A = A^{T,\delta} \in \mathfrak{A}$. Let us also note that, since the right-hand side of this inequality depends only on $z|_{[0,\delta]}$, the strategy A from (28) can be replaced with arbitrary strategy that could be represented in the form $A^T \diamond_\delta A$. Now, by (30), it is equivalent to

$$U_T(z(0)) - \frac{1}{k^2} \le v_T(z) - p^{-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_\delta) + p^{-1}U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\delta)) \qquad \forall A' \in \mathfrak{A}, z \in A \diamond_\delta A'. \tag{35}$$

Define

$$A^* = A \diamond_{\tau_1} A \diamond_{\tau_2} \cdots \diamond_{\tau_{i-1}} A \diamond_{\tau_i} \cdots \diamond_{\tau_{k-1}} A \diamond_{\tau_k} A. \tag{36}$$

Note that such A^* exists in $\mathfrak{A}$ by property $(\diamond)$.

Note that, since the sufficiently large k were chosen arbitrarily, to prove the proposition, it would suffice to demonstrate that

$$\mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda(\omega) \ge U_T(\omega) - \frac{(R+4)\ln k}{k} \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega;$$

in accordance with (34), this fact would follow from

$$c(z) > U_T(z(0)) - \frac{2\ln k}{k} \qquad \forall z \in A^*. \tag{37}$$

Step 4. Proof of estimate (37).

Remember that $p^{-1}T = T - \delta$, $\tau_{i+1} = \tau_i + \delta$, $\varrho(t) = p^{-i}$ for $t \in [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_{i+1}} \varrho(t)g(z(t))dt &= \frac{1}{T}\int_0^\delta \varrho(\tau_i)g(z(t+\tau_i))dt \\ &= \frac{p^{-i}}{T}\int_0^\delta g(z(t+\tau_i))dt \overset{(23d)}{=} p^{-i}v_T(z_{\tau_i}) - p^{-i-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_{i+1}}).\end{aligned}$$

Then, for a process $z \in \mathbb{K}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c(z) = v_T(z) - p^{-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_1}) &+ \dots \\ p^{-i}v_T(z_{\tau_i}) - p^{-i-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_{i+1}}) &+ \dots \\ p^{-k+1}v_T(z_{\tau_{k-1}}) - p^{-k}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_k}) &+ p^{-k}U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\tau_k)). \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

By (36), for every $z \in A^*$, we have $z_{\tau_{k-1}} \in A \diamond_\delta A$; then, thanks to (35), if we take into account $\tau_{k-1} + \delta = \tau_k$, we will obtain

$$v_T(z_{\tau_{k-1}}) - p^{-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_k}) + p^{-1}U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\tau_k)) \overset{(35)}{\ge} U_T(z(\tau_{k-1})) - \frac{1}{k^2} \overset{(29)}{\ge} U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\tau_{k-1})) - \frac{2}{k^2}.$$

Substituting this into (38) and accounting for $\tau_{k-1} + \delta = \tau_k$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} c(z) \ge v_T(z) - p^{-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_1}) &+ \dots \\ p^{-i}v_T(z_{\tau_i}) - p^{-i-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_{i+1}}) &+ \dots \\ p^{-k+2}v_T(z_{\tau_{k-2}}) - p^{-k+1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_{k-1}}) &+ p^{-k+1}U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\tau_{k-1})) - \frac{2}{k^2} \quad \forall z \in A^*. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

From (36) and $\tau_{k-2}+\delta=\tau_{k-1}$, we obtain $z_{\tau_{k-2}}\in A\diamond_\delta(A\diamond_\delta A)$ for every $z\in A^*$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} v_T(z_{\tau_{k-2}})-p^{-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_{k-1}})+p^{-1}U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\tau_{k-1})) &\overset{(35)}{\geq} U_T(z(\tau_{k-2}))-\frac{1}{k^2}\\ &\overset{(29)}{\geq} U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\tau_{k-2}))-\frac{2}{k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into (39), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c(z)\geq v_T(z)-p^{-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_1}) &+ \dots\\ p^{-i}v_T(z_{\tau_i})-p^{-i-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_{i+1}}) &+ \dots\\ p^{-k+3}v_T(z_{\tau_{k-3}})-p^{-k+2}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_{k-2}}) &+ p^{-k-2}U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\tau_{k-2}))-\frac{4}{k^2} \quad \forall z\in A^*. \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding in the similar way, since it is always $\tau_{k-l}+\delta=\tau_{k-l+1}$ and

$$v_T(z_{\tau_{k-l}})-p^{-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_{k-l+1}})+p^{-1}U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\tau_{k-l+1}))\geq U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\tau_{k-l+1}))-\frac{2}{k^2}$$

holds for all $z\in A^*$, we now see that, for every instance of $z\in A^*$, it holds that

$$c(z)\geq v_T(z)-p^{-1}v_{p^{-1}T}(z_{\tau_1})+p^{-1}U_{p^{-1}T}(z(\tau_1))-\frac{2k-2}{k^2}.$$

By $\tau_1=\delta$ and $\ln k>1$, the relation (35) directly implies (37) for all $z\in A^*$, which was to be proved. □

Remark 5 *As follows from the proof, the strategies that protect an asymptotic guarantee U for the payoffs w_λ, can be constructed by rule (36) with the aid of the strategies $A^{T,h}$ that protect the similar asymptotic guarantee for payoffs $\hat{c}^U_{T,h}$.*

C A guarantee for $\mathcal{W}^\flat$ is a guarantee for $\mathcal{V}^\flat$. The proof of Proposition 2

Step 1. Preliminary constructions and estimates.

Notice that U is bounded from above by a positive R.

Consider a natural k; we can map to it the numbers $M>1, p>1$ such that

$$k=M\ln M,\qquad p\triangleq e^{1/M}.$$

Note that $1+x<e^x<1+x+x^2$ for $|x|\in(0,1)$. By $M>1$, we have $p=e^{1/M}=1+\frac{1}{M}+\frac{r'}{M^2}$, $p^{-1}=e^{-1/M}=1-\frac{1}{M}+\frac{r''}{M^2}$ for some $r',r''\in(0,1)$. Then,

$$\frac{1-\frac{p}{M}}{M(1-p^{-1})}=\frac{1-\frac{1}{M}-\frac{1}{M^2}-\frac{r'}{M^3}}{1-\frac{r''}{M}}<1. \tag{40}$$

By $(15b)$, for k (and, therefore, M) there exists $T_0 > k = M \ln M$ such that

$$U_{\frac{pM}{T}} \le U_{\frac{M}{T}} + \frac{1}{k^2} \qquad \forall T > T_0. \tag{41}$$

Since U is a subsolution, thanks to $(14b)$, we also can choose T_0 such that, for each positive $\lambda < M/T_0$, for each $h > 0$, there exists $A^{\lambda,h} \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that, for all $z \in A^{\lambda,h}$,

$$U_\lambda(z(0)) - \frac{1}{k^2} < \lambda \int_0^h e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + e^{-\lambda h} U_\lambda(z(h)) \overset{(23d)}{=} w_\lambda(z) - e^{-\lambda h} w_\lambda(z_h) + e^{-\lambda h} U_\lambda(z(h)). \tag{42}$$

Let us fix such k, M, p, T_0. Fix also some $T > T_0$. Define

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{T}, \quad t_0 = \frac{T}{M}, \quad \tau_0 = 0, \quad t_i = t_0 p^{-i}, \quad \tau_i = \tau_{i-1} + t_{i-1} \qquad \forall i \in \overline{1,k}.$$

Then, we have the following succession of equalities and inequalities:

$$p^{-k} = e^{-\ln M} = \frac{1}{M}, \tag{43}$$

$$\lambda p^i \le \lambda p^k = \lambda M = \frac{M}{T} \le \frac{M}{T_0}, \quad U_{\lambda p^i}(\omega) \overset{(41)}{\ge} U_{\lambda p^{i-1}}(\omega) - \frac{1}{k^2} \qquad \forall i \in \overline{1,k}, \omega \in \Omega. \tag{44}$$

Let us also note that t_i constitute a monotonically decreasing geometric progression; τ_i are their partial sums, and

$$\frac{1 - \frac{p}{M}}{M(1-p^{-1})} \overset{(43)}{=} \frac{1 - p^{-k+1}}{M(1-p^{-1})} = \frac{\tau_k}{T} \overset{(40)}{\le} 1. \tag{45}$$

Step 2. Constructing a near-v_T functional.

Define a scalar function ϱ on $(0, \tau_k]$ by

$$\varrho(t) = e^{-\lambda p^i (t - \tau_{i-1})} \qquad \forall i \in \overline{1,k}, t \in (\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i].$$

Note that on each such subinterval,

$$1 \ge \varrho(t) \ge e^{-\lambda p^i (\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i)} = e^{-\lambda p^i t_i} = e^{-\lambda t_0} = e^{-1/M} = p^{-1} > 1 - \frac{1}{M}, \quad \forall i \in \overline{1,k}, t \in (\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]. \tag{46}$$

Consider a lower game with the following payoff

$$c(z) \triangleq \lambda \int_0^{\tau_k} \varrho(t) g(z(t))\, dt + p^{-k} U_{\lambda p^k}(z(\tau_k)) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^{\tau_k} \varrho(t) g(z(t))\, dt + p^{-k} U_{\lambda p^k}(z(\tau_k)), \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{K}.$$

Recall that $0 \le g \le 1$, $U \le R$; now, for every process $z \in \mathbb{K}$,

$$p^{-k} U_{\lambda p^k}(z(\tau_k)) \le p^{-k} R \overset{(43)}{=} \frac{R}{M}$$

implies

$$v_T(z) \overset{(45)}{\ge} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^{\tau_k} g(z(t))\, dt \overset{(46)}{\ge} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^{\tau_k} \varrho(t) g(z(t))\, dt \ge c(z) - \frac{R}{M} \qquad \forall z \in \mathbb{K}. \tag{47}$$

Step 3. Constructing strategy A^*.

Note that, for every $i = \overline{0,k-1}$, we have $e^{-\lambda p^i t_i} = p^{-1}$ by (46) and $\lambda p^i < M/T_0$ by (44). Then, by (42), there exists a strategy $A^{(i)} \triangleq A^{\lambda p^i, t_i} \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that

$$U_{\lambda p^i}(z(0)) \le w_{\lambda p^i}(z) - p^{-1} w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{t_i}) + p^{-1} U_{\lambda p^i}(z(t_i)) + \frac{1}{k^2} \qquad \forall z \in A^{(i)}. \tag{48}$$

Since the right-hand side of this inequality depend only on $z|_{[0,t_i]}$, the strategy $A^{(i)}$ can be replaced with arbitrary strategy that could be expressed in the form $A^{(i)} \diamond_{t_i} A'$. Thus,

$$U_{\lambda p^i}(z(0)) \le w_{\lambda p^i}(z) - p^{-1} w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{t_i}) + p^{-1} U_{\lambda p^i}(z(t_i)) + \frac{1}{k^2} \quad \forall i \in \overline{0,k-1}, A' \in \mathfrak{A}, z \in A^{(i)} \diamond_{t_i} A'. \tag{49}$$

By property $(\diamond)$, there exists a strategy

$$A^* \triangleq A^{(0)} \diamond_{\tau_1} A^{(1)} \diamond_{\tau_2} \cdots\cdots \diamond_{\tau_{k-1}} A^{(k)} \in \mathfrak{A}. \tag{50}$$

In view of $\tau_{i+1} = \tau_i + t_i$, for A^* constructed in this way, there exists $A' \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $z_{\tau_i} \in A^{(i)} \diamond_{t_i} A'$ for all $z \in A^*, i \in \overline{0,k-1}$. Now, (49) implies

$$U_{\lambda p^i}(z(\tau_i)) \le w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{\tau_i}) - p^{-1} w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{\tau_{i+1}}) + p^{-1} U_{\lambda p^i}(z(\tau_{i+1})) + \frac{1}{k^2} \qquad \forall z \in A^*, i \in \overline{0,k-1}.$$

Finally, from (44), we obtain

$$U_{\lambda p^i}(z(\tau_i)) \le w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{\tau_i}) - p^{-1} w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{\tau_{i+1}}) + p^{-1} U_{\lambda p^{i+1}}(z(\tau_{i+1})) + \frac{2}{k^2} \qquad \forall z \in A^*, i \in \overline{0,k-1}. \tag{51}$$

Recall that $A^* \in \mathfrak{A}$ and, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, we have

$$\mathcal{V}_T^\flat(\omega) \ge \inf_{z \in A^* \cap \Gamma(\omega)} v_T(z).$$

Since M (with $k = M \ln M$) can be arbitrary large, to prove the proposition, it would suffice to prove the inequality

$$v_T(z) > U_\lambda(z(0)) - \frac{R}{M} - \frac{2}{M \ln M} \qquad \forall z \in A^*,$$

which follows from (47) and

$$c(z) \ge U_\lambda(z(0)) - \frac{2}{k} \qquad \forall z \in A^*. \tag{52}$$

Step 4. Proof of estimate (52).

For each $z \in \mathbb{K}$, $i = \overline{0,k-1}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_{i+1}} \varrho(t) g(z_t) dt &= \lambda \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_{i+1}} e^{-\lambda p^i (t-\tau_i)} g(z(t))\, dt \\
&= \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda p^i t} g(z(t+\tau_i))\, dt - \lambda e^{-\lambda p^i (\tau_{i+1}-\tau_i)} \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda p^i t} g(z(t+\tau_{i+1}))\, dt \\
&\overset{(46)}{=} \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda p^i t} g(z_{\tau_i}(t))\, dt - \lambda p^{-1} \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda p^i t} g(z_{\tau_{i+1}}(t))\, dt \\
&= p^{-i} w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{\tau_i}) - p^{-i-1} w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{\tau_{i+1}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, for each $z \in A^*$, $i = \overline{0, k-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_{i+1}} \varrho(t) g(z_t)\, dt &= p^{-i} w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{\tau_i}) - p^{-i-1} w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{\tau_{i+1}}) + p^{-i-1} U_{\lambda p^{i+1}}(z(\tau_{i+1})) - p^{-i-1} U_{\lambda p^{i+1}}(z(\tau_{i+1})) \\
&= p^{-i}\Big(w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{\tau_i}) - p^{-1} w_{\lambda p^i}(z_{\tau_{i+1}}) + p^{-1} U_{\lambda p^{i+1}}(z(\tau_{i+1}))\Big) - p^{-i-1} U_{\lambda p^{i+1}}(z(\tau_{i+1})) \\
&\overset{(51)}{\geq} p^{-i} U_{\lambda p^i}(z(\tau_i)) - p^{-i-1} U_{\lambda p^{i+1}}(z(\tau_{i+1})) - \frac{2}{k^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing over all the intervals $[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
c(z) &= p^{-k} U_{\lambda p^k}(z(\tau_k)) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \lambda \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_{i+1}} \varrho(t) g(z_t)\, dt \\
&\geq p^{-k} U_{\lambda p^k}(z(\tau_k)) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \Big[p^{-i} U_{\lambda p^i}(z(\tau_i)) - p^{-i-1} U_{\lambda p^{i+1}}(z(\tau_{i+1})) - \frac{2}{k^2} \Big] \\
&= p^{-k} U_{\lambda p^k}(z(\tau_k)) + U_\lambda(z(\tau_0)) - p^{-k} U_{\lambda p^k}(z(\tau_k)) - \frac{2}{k} \\
&= U_\lambda(z(0)) - \frac{2}{k} \qquad\qquad \forall z \in A^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, inequality (52) is proved. □

Remark 6 *As follows from the proof, the strategies protecting an asymptotic guarantee U for payoffs v_T can be constructed by rule (50) with the aid of strategies $A^{\lambda,h}$ that protect the similar asymptotic guarantee for payoffs like $\check{c}^U_{\lambda,h}$.*

D Tauberian theorem for differential games

Consider a nonlinear system in $\mathbb{R}^n$ controlled by two players

$$\dot{x} = f(x, a, b),\ x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n,\ a(t) \in \mathbb{A},\ b(t) \in \mathbb{B} \qquad a.e.\ t \geq 0; \tag{53}$$

here, $\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{B}$ are compact metric spaces.

Here and below, we assume functions $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B} \to [0, 1]$ are

1. continuous;

2. Lipschitz continuous in the state variable, namely, for a constant $L > 0$,

$$\big|\big| f(x, a, b) - f(y, a, b) \big|\big| + \big| g(x, a, b) - g(y, a, b) \big| \leq L \big|\big| x - y \big|\big| \qquad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, a \in \mathbb{A}, b \in \mathbb{B}.$$

Remember that $B(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{A})$ and $B(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{B})$ are the sets of all Borel measurable functions $\mathbb{T} \ni t \mapsto a(t) \in \mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{T} \ni t \mapsto b(t) \in \mathbb{B}$, respectively. Since the elements of both $\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{B}$

are functions, not equivalence classes, hereinafter, in this section, all equivalences default to everywhere, not almost everywhere.

Now, for each pair $(a,b) \in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{A}) \times B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{B})$, for every initial condition $x(0) = x_* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, system (53) generates the unique solution $x(\cdot) = y(\cdot; x_*, a, b)$ defined for all $\mathbb{T}$. Denote by $Y(x_*)$ the set of all such solutions with $x(0) = x_*$.

Consider a set $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ that is strongly invariant with respect to system (53), i.e., let $x(t) \in \mathbb{X}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$, $x_* \in \mathbb{X}$, $x \in Y(x_*)$. Define $\mathbb{Y} \triangleq \cup_{x_* \in \mathbb{X}} Y(x_*)$.

Let us further assume the Isaacs' condition (also referred to as 'solvability of the small game' [33]) holds, i.e.,

$$\max_{a\in\mathbb{A}} \min_{b\in\mathbb{B}} \left[s \cdot f(x,a,b) + g(x,a,b)\right] = \min_{b\in\mathbb{B}} \max_{a\in\mathbb{A}} \left[s \cdot f(x,a,b) + g(x,a,b)\right] \quad \forall x, s \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{54a}$$

Easy see that, for each positive function $\varrho : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, it implies, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\max_{a\in\mathbb{A}} \min_{b\in\mathbb{B}} \left[s \cdot f(x,a,b) + \varrho(t) g(x,a,b)\right] = \min_{b\in\mathbb{B}} \max_{a\in\mathbb{A}} \left[s \cdot f(x,a,b) + \varrho(t) g(x,a,b)\right] \quad \forall x, s \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{54b}$$

The goal of the first player is to maximize the payoff function while the task of the second is to minimize it. Our payoff functions are the following: for each positive T, λ, for all $(x,a,b) \in \mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}$,

$$v_T(x,a,b) \triangleq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T g(x(t),a(t),b(t))\, dt, \qquad w_\lambda(x,a,b) \triangleq \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} g(x(t),a(t),b(t))\, dt. \tag{55}$$

Note that (54b) for $\varrho(t) \equiv \frac{1}{T}$ and $\varrho(t) \equiv \lambda e^{-\lambda t}$ becomes the Isaacs' condition for the payoff functions v_T and w_λ, respectively.

There are many ways to define a game and the sets of strategies for each player; for a very well made review encompassing a large number of formalizations, refer to [48, Subsect.14,15]. The Isaacs' condition not only provides the equality of lower and upper values; in addition, it makes value functions independent of formalization of strategies [34],[48, Subsect. 14],[8]. For the definition of the value of the game, we can employ, for example the nonanticipating strategies (see [46],[20]). Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ be the sets of all nonanticipating strategies for the first player and second player respectively (see [48],[8, Definition VIII.1.1]). For all $\lambda, T > 0$, define the value functions $\mathcal{V}_T^\natural, \mathcal{W}_\lambda^\natural$ as follows: for all $x_* \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V}_T^\natural(x_*) &\triangleq \sup_{Q\in\mathcal{A}} \inf_{b\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{B})} v_T(y(\cdot;x_*,Q(b),b),Q(b),b) = \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{B}} \sup_{a\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{A})} v_T(y(\cdot;x_*,a,Q(a)),a,Q(a)),\\
\mathcal{W}_\lambda^\natural(x_*) &\triangleq \sup_{Q\in\mathcal{A}} \inf_{b\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{B})} w_\lambda(y(\cdot;x_*,Q(b),b),Q(b),b) = \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{B}} \sup_{a\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{A})} w_\lambda(y(\cdot;x_*,a,Q(a)),a,Q(a)).
\end{aligned}$$

A variant of the following theorem was also announced in [29, 30] and proved in [31] with the aid of nonanticipating operators [17],[18].

Theorem 6 *Let* $\mathbb{X}$ *be strongly invariant with respect to system* (53) *. Assume Isaacs' condition* (54*a*) *.*

The following limits exist, are uniform in $x_* \in \mathbb{X}$ *, and coincide*

$$\lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \mathcal{V}^\natural_T(x_*) = \lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0} \mathcal{W}^\natural_\lambda(x_*) \quad \forall x_* \in \mathbb{X}$$

if at least one of these limits exists and is uniform in $x_* \in \mathbb{X}$*.*

The proof of this theorem will appear to be an immediate consequence of Theorem 3. Since we only require the closedness of the set of strategies with respect to concatenation, we will choose among the feedback-type formalizations. To make the references more convenient, take the class of feedback strategies with perfect memory and perfect state measurement [33, Ch. XIV]; see also [8, Definition VIII.3.1],[19],[34, Sect. 11]. For proof of identity between the values defined through nonanticipating strategies and through feedback strategies with perfect memory and perfect state measurement, refer to [48, Subsect. 14],[8, Theorem VIII.3.11].

Definition of feedback MM **-strategies.**

Definition 8 *A map* $\zeta : \mathbb{Y} \to B(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \mathbb{A})$ *is a feedback MM-strategy (feedback strategy with perfect memory and perfect state measurement [8, Definition VIII.3.1]) for the first player if*
1) for each $t > 0$ *,* $x|_{[0,t]} = y|_{[0,t]}$ *implies* $\zeta[x]|_{(0,t]} = \zeta[y]|_{(0,t]}$ *;*
2) for all $x_* \in \mathbb{X}, b \in B(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{B}), T > 0$ *, there exists a unique Carathéodory solution* $x(\cdot) = y(\cdot, x_*, \zeta, b)$ *of*

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), \zeta[x(\cdot)](t), b(t)), \qquad x(0) = x_*, \qquad \text{a.e. } t \in (0, T]. \tag{56}$$

We denote by $\mathfrak{F}$ the set of feedback MM-strategies for the first player. This definition directly implies that a solution $y(\cdot, x_*, \zeta, b)$ (on $(0, T]$) can be uniquely extended up to a solution of (56) (for a.a. positive t) from $\mathbb{Y} \subset C(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{X})$; therefore, we may take $y(\cdot, x_*, \zeta, b) \in \mathbb{Y}$. Now, denote $\alpha[x_*, \zeta, b] \triangleq \zeta[y(\cdot, x_*, \zeta, b)] \in B(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{A})$ for all $x_* \in \mathbb{X}, \zeta \in \mathfrak{F}, b \in B(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{B})$. This definition is well-defined; moreover,

$$y(\cdot, x_*, \zeta, b) = y(\cdot, x_*, \alpha[x_*, \zeta, b], b).$$

Feedback MM-strategies for the second player are introduced in the similar way. Assign the set $\mathfrak{G}$ of feedback MM-strategies to the second player; for each $\xi \in \mathfrak{G}$, for each $x_* \in \mathbb{X}$, for each $a \in B(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{A})$, there exist a unique $y(\cdot, x_*, a, \xi) \in \mathbb{Y}$, a unique $\beta[x_*, a, \xi] \in B(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{B})$.

Thanks to the Isaacs condition, by [33],[48] for payoffs v_T , by [8, Theorem VIII.3.11] for payoffs w_λ, the values of upper and lower games coincide; moreover, these values coincide with the values defined by nonanticipating strategies. Thus, for all $T > 0, \lambda > 0, x_* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{V}^\natural_T(x_*) = \sup_{\zeta\in\mathfrak{F}} \inf_{b\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{B})} v_T(y(\cdot; x_*, \zeta, b), \alpha[x_*, \zeta, b], b) = \inf_{\xi\in\mathfrak{G}} \sup_{a\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{A})} v_T(y(\cdot; x_*, a, \xi), a, \beta[x_*, a, \xi]);$$

$$\mathcal{W}^\natural_\lambda(x_*) = \sup_{\zeta\in\mathfrak{F}} \inf_{b\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{B})} w_\lambda(y(\cdot; x_*, \zeta, b), \alpha[x_*, \zeta, b], b) = \inf_{\xi\in\mathfrak{G}} \sup_{a\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{A})} w_\lambda(y(\cdot; x_*, a, \xi), a, \beta[x_*, a, \xi]).$$

In particular, like in Sect. 2, we may now assume that one player announces his own feedback MM- strategy (from either $\mathfrak{F}$, or $\mathfrak{G}$, respectively) and another, knowing it, selects a measurable control (either from $B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{B})$ or $B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{A})$, respectively).

Proof of Theorem 6. Reduction to the abstract formulation.

Since the function g depends on a,b in addition to depending on x, let us set

$$\Omega \triangleq \mathbb{X}\times\mathbb{A}\times\mathbb{B},\quad \mathbb{K}\triangleq\{(y,a,b)\,|\,y\in\mathbb{Y},a\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{A}),b\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{B})\}.$$

Moreover, the mappings v_T, w_λ defined in view of (55) correspond to those defined in view of (9). Still, $\Gamma(\omega)=\{z=(x,a,b)\in\mathbb{K}\,|\,z(0)=\omega\}$ for all $\omega\in\Omega$. It remains to describe $\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B}$.

For each $\zeta\in\mathfrak{F}$, it is valid to define

$$A_\zeta \triangleq \bigcup_{a\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{A}),b\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{B}),x_*\in\mathbb{X}}\{(x,a,b)\in\mathbb{K}|\ x\triangleq y(\cdot;x_*,\zeta,b),a|_{(0,\infty)}=\zeta[x]\};\ \mathfrak{A}\triangleq\{A_\zeta\subset\mathbb{K}\,|\,\zeta\in\mathfrak{F}\}.$$

We can define B_ξ for each $\xi\in\mathfrak{G}$ and the set $\mathfrak{B}$ in a similar way.

For all $T>0,\lambda>0$, define the mappings $\mathcal{V}_T^\flat,\mathcal{V}_T^\sharp,\mathcal{W}_\lambda^\flat,\mathcal{W}_\lambda^\sharp$ from Ω to $[0,1]$ by formulas (10a), (10b). Note that, since $y(\cdot;x_*,\alpha(b),b)$ is independent of $a(0)$ and $b(0)$, each of payoffs $v_T, w_\lambda,\ \check{c}^U_{h,\lambda},\hat{c}^U_{h,T}$ (for all $h,T,\lambda>0,\ U:\Omega\to[0,1]$) is independent of them as well.

Proof of Theorem 6. Verification of conditions of Theorem 3.

We claim that, for all $\omega=(x_*,a_*,b_*)\in\Omega,\ T,\lambda>0$

$$\mathcal{V}_T^\flat(x_*,a_*,b_*)=\mathcal{V}_T^\sharp(x_*,a_*,b_*)=\mathcal{V}^\natural(x_*),\ \mathcal{W}_\lambda^\sharp(x_*,a_*,b_*)=\mathcal{W}_\lambda^\flat(x_*,a_*,b_*)=\mathcal{W}_\lambda^\natural(x_*).\qquad(57)$$

Indeed, for each choice $\zeta\in\mathfrak{F}$ by the first player, a choice $b\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{B})$ by the second player determines the unique process (x,a',b') with $x\triangleq y(\cdot;x_*,\zeta,b)$, $b'(0)=b_*, b'|_{(0,\infty)}=b|_{(0,\infty)}, a'(0)=a_*, a'|_{(0,\infty)}=\zeta[x](b)$. By $y(\cdot,x_*,\zeta,b)=y(\cdot,x_*,\alpha[x_*,\zeta,b],b)$, $\alpha[x_*,\zeta,b]=\zeta[y(\cdot,x_*,\zeta,b)]$, this is equivalent to the choice of $A_\zeta\in\mathfrak{A}$ followed by the choice of $z\in A_\zeta\cap\Gamma(\omega)$. Thus, (57) holds. Moreover, now, $A_\zeta\cap\Gamma(\omega)\neq\varnothing$. This implies condition $(\mathcal{P})$ for $\mathfrak{A}$. One can, totally analogously, prove condition $(\mathcal{P})$ for $\mathfrak{B}$.

We claim that condition $(\diamond)$ holds for the introduced families $\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B}$. In view of the symmetry, we will only prove this fact for $\mathfrak{A}$. Fix $\zeta',\zeta''\in\mathfrak{F},\tau>0$. Let us define the mapping $\zeta:\mathbb{Y}\to B(\mathbb{R}_{>0},\mathbb{A})$ piecemeal: first $\zeta[x]|_{(0,\tau]}$, then, $\zeta[x]|_{(\tau,\infty)}$.

Assume $\zeta[x]|_{(0,\tau]}=\zeta'[x]|_{(0,\tau]}$ for all $x\in\mathbb{Y}$. Conditions 1),2) from the definition of MM-strategy hold for ζ under positive $T\le\tau$ because they hold for ζ'.

Similar to (13), for all $\tau>0,x\in\mathbb{Y},b\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{B})$, define x_τ,b_τ as follows: $x_\tau(t)=x(t+\tau), b_\tau(t)=b(t+\tau)$ for all $t\in\mathbb{T}$. Note that, since $f,\mathbb{B}$ are independent of t, we have $x_\tau\in\mathbb{Y},b_\tau\in B(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{B})$.

Then, we can define $\zeta[x](t+\tau)=\zeta''[x_\tau](t)$ for all $t>\tau,x\in\mathbb{Y}$, i.e., $(\zeta[x])_\tau=\zeta''[x_\tau]$. It is easy see that this mapping $\mathbb{Y}\ni x\mapsto\zeta[x]|_{(\tau,\infty)}$ is nonanticipating because ζ'' is nonanticipating.

Therefore, the map ζ is nonanticipating. To prove Condition 2) from the definition of MM-strategy for all $T > \tau$, note that, for an initial condition $x_* \in \mathbb{X}$ at 0 and arbitrary $b \in B(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{B})$, there exists a unique solution $y(\cdot, x_*, \zeta, b)|_{[0,\tau]}$ of (56), in particular, $y(\tau, x_*, \zeta, b)$ is also well-defined. In addition, because ζ'' is an MM-strategy, for an initial position at τ (in particular, for position $y(\tau, x_*, \zeta, b)$), for a control of second player, for every $T > \tau$, there exists a unique solution of (56) on the interval $[\tau, T]$. Then, 2) holds for ζ. Thus, ζ is an MM-strategy.

Now, we have $\alpha[x_*, \zeta, b]|_{[0,\tau]} = \alpha[x_*, \zeta', b]|_{[0,\tau]}$, $\alpha[x_*, \zeta, b](t + \tau) = \alpha[y(\tau, x_*, \zeta, b), \zeta'', b_\tau](t)$ for all $x_* \in \mathbb{X}$, $b \in B(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{B})$, $t > \tau$; i.e., $\{(x, a, b) \in A_\zeta \,|\, x(0) = x_*\} = \{(x, a, b) \in A_{\zeta'} \diamond_\tau A_{\zeta''} \,|\, x(0) = x_*\}$. So, $A_\zeta = A_{\zeta'} \diamond_\tau A_{\zeta''} \in \mathfrak{A}$ for all $\zeta', \zeta'' \in \mathfrak{F}, \tau > 0$, and condition $(\diamond)$ holds for $\mathfrak{A}$.

Consider a payoff c among v_T, w_λ, $\check{c}^U_{h,\lambda}, \hat{c}^U_{h,T}$ (for all $h, T, \lambda > 0$, $U : \Omega \to [0, 1]$). This payoff c is bounded and independent of $a(0)$ and $b(0)$, therefore, by definition of the lower values, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, for each initial x_*, there exists ζ^{x_*} with $\inf\limits_{z \in A_{\zeta^{x_*}}} c(z) > \mathbb{V}^\flat[c](z(0)) - \varepsilon$. Define $\zeta_* : \mathbb{Y} \to B(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{B})$ as follows: $\zeta_*[y] \triangleq \zeta^{y(0)}[y]$ for all $y \in \mathbb{Y}$. By straightforward verification of conditions 1)-2), it is easily proved that ζ_* is MM-strategy. By the construction, this MM-strategy is an ε-optimal MM-strategy for the payoff c. Therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the lower game with this payoff has ε-optimal strategy. The proof of existence of ε-optimal strategy for the upper game with this payoff for all $\varepsilon > 0$ is analogous. It remains to prove that for all games mentioned in the formulation of Theorem 3 there exists a saddle point.

Remember that, by [48, Subsect. 14]),[8, Theorem VIII.3.11], for all payoffs v_T, w_λ $(\lambda, T > 0)$, the condition (54b) for corresponding ϱ implies that a differential game with dynamics (53) and this payoff has a saddle point. In particular, its value functions are bounded (lies in $[0, 1]$) and continuous [8, Proposition VIII.1.8],[48, Theorem 11.4]. By [48, Theorem 11.4], it is the same for the payoff

$$\int_0^h \varrho(t) g(z(t))\, dt + S(z(h))$$

if the functions $S : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\varrho : [0, h] \to \mathbb{R}$ are bounded and continuous. Then, it is the same for payoffs $\check{c}^S_{h,\lambda}, \hat{c}^S_{h,T}$ for all $h, \lambda, T > 0$ and for each $S = \mathcal{V}^\flat_T, S = \mathcal{V}^\sharp_T, S = \mathcal{W}^\flat_\lambda, S = \mathcal{W}^\sharp_\lambda$. So, each of the games needed for Theorem 3 has a saddle point.

All conditions of Theorem 3 hold. Applying this theorem, we prove the result of Theorem 6. □